Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/expositorytimes0000awha

THE

EXPOSITORY TIMES.

FOUNDED IN 1889 BY

JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

EDITED BY

A. W. HASTINGS, M.A.

AND

REV. E. HASTINGS, M.A.

VOLUME THE FORTY-NINTH

OCTOBER 1937 – SEPTEMBER 1938.

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
E965
T582 51,996

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED
FOR
T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.
LONDON . . . . . SIMPKIN MARSHALL, LTD.
NEW YORK . . . . . CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XLIX.

AUTHORS.

PAGE

P. M. S. Allen, B.A.—
Luke 17^{21} 476

Anonymous—
The Fight for Christianity in Germany . . 408

Rev. John A. Bain, D.D.—
Recent Foreign Theology 473

Rev. T. A. Bampton—
More than Conquerors 318

Rev. William Barclay, B.D.—
Church and State in the Apologists . . 360

Rev. Professor Allan Barr, M.A.—
The Factor of Testimony in the Gospels . 401

Rev. John O. Barrett, M.A.—
Virginibus Puerisque 366

Professor Karl Barth—
The Basic Forms of Theological Thought . 5

Rev. A. Beaghen—
Virginibus Puerisque 276

Rev. Roderick Bethune, M.A.—
Virginibus Puerisque 26

Rev. Eric F. F. Bishop—
εἰ μὴ εἷς Θεὸς—A Suggestion . . . 363

Rev. W. Russell Bowie, D.D.—
What we all need to Learn—How to Pray . 134

Rev. Charles W. Budden, M.A., M.D.—
Virginibus Puerisque 412

R. G. Bury, Litt.D.—
Romans 12^{16}; 1 Corinthians 13^{7} . . . 430

Rev. P. N. Bushill, B.A.—
Virginibus Puerisque 316

Rev. David Cairns, B.A.—
Christian Unity 28
Christianity in Action—The Christian Faith and Freedom 59

Rev. R. F. Calder, B.A., B.D.—
Virginibus Puerisque 174

Professor Maurice A. Canney—
'Healing' in the Book of Proverbs . . 237

Rev. Principal Sydney Cave, M.A., D.D.—
Professor Barth's Dogmatics 376

Rev. Principal H. F. Lovell Cocks, M.A., B.D.—
The Place of the Sermon in Worship . . 264

Rev. Professor R. Corkey, M.A., D.Phil., M.P.—
War, Pacifism, and Peace 349

Right Rev. A. A. David, D.D.—
Christianity in Action—The Church and the Social Services 200

Rev. John B. Davie, M.A.—
Virginibus Puerisque 223

Rev. R. Oswald Davies—
Virginibus Puerisque 126

Rev. Harold Derbyshire—
Virginibus Puerisque 460

Rev. F. W. Dillistone, M.A., B.D.—
Christianity in Eclipse: Some Lessons from History 454

Rev. Charles Dimond—
Virginibus Puerisque 77

G. R. Driver, M.A.—
Ecclesiasticus: A New Fragment of the Hebrew Text 37

Rev. Robert J. Drummond, D.D.—
Genesis 1 and John 1^{1-14} 568

W. Rhydderch Evans—
Virginibus Puerisque. 559

Rev. Francis A. Evelyn, B.A.—
The Supra-Racial Gospel 419

Rev. J. G. Grant Fleming, D.S.O., M.C., M.A.—
Sacredness of Strength 30
A Harvest Thanksgiving Sermon . . . 560

Rev. R. C. Ford, M.A., B.D.—
Symbolism in Worship 344

Principal W. Fulton, D.D.—
The Life to Come 46

Rev. A. E. Garvie, D.D.—
Recent Foreign Theology . 42, 91, 183, 333, 425
The Value of the New Testament for the Christian Church 456

T. H. Gaster—
Deuteronomy 32^{25} 525
Exodus 15^{2}: עָזִּי וְזִמְרָת יָהּ 189

A. C. Graham—
A Note on Genesis 26^{7-11} 236

J. Gwyn Griffiths—
Romans 8^{28} 474

Rev. Harold A. Guy, B.A., B.D.—
Matthew 11^{25-27}; Luke $10^{21, 22}$ 236

Sir Daniel M. Hamilton—
Christianity in Action—Stewardship of Wealth 136

Rev. J. C. Hardwick, B.Sc.—
Burnett Hillman Streeter 249

Rev. R. A. Hardy, B.A.—
Virginibus Puerisque 223

Rev. F. G. Hastings, B.A.—
Virginibus Puerisque 367

Rev. H. S. Hayman—
The Parable of the Pearl Merchant: Matthew $13^{45, 46}$ 142

Rev. C. M. Hepburn, B.D.—
Virginibus Puerisque . . 175, 275, 514, 559

Rev. David H. Hislop, D.D.—
The Basis of Worship 149

Stephen Hobhouse—
'Let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican' (Mt 18^{17}). 43
Intercession and its Objectives 87

Rev. Hedley Hodkin, M.A.—
The Authority of the Bible To-day . . 231

Rev. Norman V. Hope, M.A., B.D.—
The Assurances of God's Favour . . 414

Rev. T. Hywel Hughes, M.A., D.Litt., D.D.—
The Psychology of the Oxford Group Movement 442

Professor A. M. Hunter, B.D., Ph.D.—
Faith, Hope, Love—A Primitive Christian Triad 428

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
AUG 11 1961

PAGE
Rev. A. Mitchell Hunter, D.Litt., F.R.S.E.—
Calvin: A Character Sketch 509
Rev. John A. Irvine, B.A.—
Old Texts in Modern Translations: Numbers 10^{29-32} (Moffatt) 20
Rev. J. W. Jack, D.D.—
Recent Biblical Archæology 122, 272, 422, 556
The Lachish Letters 380
Rev. A. Gordon James—
Ought We to Consider the Consequences? . 39
Rev. Lewis Johnson—
John 4^{44} 236
Rev. H. L. Johnston, M.C., M.A.—
Christianity in Action—Canon H. R. L. Sheppard, C.H., D.D. 164
Rev. Arthur King, M.A.—
St. Peter's Memories of Holy Week and Eastertide 278
Principal W. F. Lofthouse, D.D.—
Old Texts in Modern Translations: Isaiah 65^{11} (Moffatt) 102
Rev. J. S. MacArthur, M.A., B.D.—
The Early Church and Pacifism . . 504
Professor J. F. McFadyen, D.D.—
Old Texts in Modern Translations: 1 Corinthians 1^{10} (Moffatt) 72
Principal Emeritus W. M. Macgregor, D.D.—
James Denney 552
Very Rev. Ebenezer Macmillan, D.D.—
Christianity in Action—The Church and the Oxford Group 329
Rev. Harry Q. Macqueen, M.A.—
Our Lord's Temptations—and Ours . . 229
Rev. W. J. Masson, B.D.—
Discontinuity in the Physical and the Spiritual 22
Professor John Mauchline, B.D.—
Ecstasy 295
Rev. Stewart Mechie, M.A.—
A Sermon for Remembrance Day . . 35
Rev. H. G. Meecham, M.A., B.D., Ph.D.—
The Epistle of St. James 181
Professor J. Hugh Michael, M.A., D.D.—
East, North, South, West . . . 141
The Text of Romans 6^{13} in the Chester Beatty Papyrus 235
Why Don't We Preach the Apocalypse? . 438
Constance Miles—
Some Thoughts on Bereavement . . 381
Professor James Moffatt, D.D.—
Recent Foreign Theology 41, 333
Rev. J. H. Morrison, D.D.—
The Reformation and the English Bible . 246
The Missionary Prophet 487
Rev. H. K. Moulton, M.A.—
Scripture Quotations in the Pastoral Epistles 94
Rev. John Mowat, M.A.—
Virginibus Puerisque 125
Rev. T. M. Napier, B.D.—
The Enigma of the Swords . . . 467
Rev. T. Nicklin, M.A.—
'House' and 'Home' in New Testament Greek 566
Professor Godfrey E. Phillips, M.A.—
The Best Books on Missions . . . 9
Rev. R. Martin Pope, M.A., B.D.—
The Greek Style of St. Paul . . . 534
Rev. J. E. Rattenbury, D.D.—
Worship and Sacraments 3
Rev. James Reid, D.D.—
Old Texts in Modern Translations: Luke 24^{35} (Moffatt) 1
Professor Harold Roberts, Ph.D.—
Fellowship in Worship 2
Very Rev. Richard Roberts, D.D.—
Old Texts in Modern Translations: Philippians 1^{27} 3
Rev. Stuart Robertson, M.A.—
Virginibus Puerisque . 27, 411, 459, 5
Principal H. Wheeler Robinson, D.D.—
Old Texts in Modern Translations: Jeremiah $45^{4.5}$ (McFadyen) 2
Professor T. H. Robinson, D.D.—
Recent Foreign Theology . 184, 426, 470, 5
Principal W. Robinson, M.A., B.Sc., D.D.—
Freedom and Tradition in Religious Thought 1
Allan Rowe—
Interesting New Finds in Egypt . . 3
Professor R. B. Y. Scott, Ph.D.—
The Parable of the Unjust Steward (Lk $16^{1ff.}$) 2
Rev. Edward Shillito, M.A., B.A.—
What Jesus Made of Men . . . 4
Rev. James D. Smart, M.A., Ph.D.—
The Return of Theology to the Church . 2
Rev. F. A. M. Spencer, D.D.—
The Advent Hope 1
Rev. F. C. Spurr—
The Jewish Problem 54
Rev. James S. Stewart, B.D.—
Old Texts in Modern Translations: Philippians $4^{6.7}$ (Moffatt) 26
Rev. R. W. Stewart, B.D., B.Sc.—
David: Minstrel, Poet, Saint . 12
Rev. J. T. Taylor—
Virginibus Puerisque 31
Principal Vincent Taylor, D.D.—
Recent Foreign Theology 42
Professor W. R. Taylor, Ph.D., D.D.—
Aramaic Gospel-Sources and Form-Criticism 5
Rev. R. E. Thomas, M.A.—
Virginibus Puerisque 7
Evelyn Underhill, D.D.—
The Christian Year in Worship . . . 31
Rev. Leigh Waller, B.A.—
Subduing Cynicism 8
Rev. Philip S. Watson, M.A.—
Recent Foreign Theology . . . 47
Some Theological Implications of Agape and Eros 53
Rev. Charles A. Webster, D.D.—
St. Mark 6^{20} 9
Rev. T. Wigley, M.A.—
Faith, Rational and Religious . . . 31
Rev. John Wilding, B.A.—
A Seventeenth-Century 'Manual for Ministers' 33
Rev. G. Holland Williams, M.A.—
Abraham's Altar 52
Rev. James P. Wilson, B.D.—
The Translation of 2 Timothy 2^{26} . . 4
Rev. W. A. Wordsworth, M.A.—
A Prophet in his own Country (Jn 4^{44}) 92, 42
'Until Shiloh Come' (Gn 49^{10}) . . . 14

SUBJECTS.

PAGE
Adler 293
Advent 97, 106, 127, 129, 144
Agape and Eros 537
Apocalypse, Preaching from 438
Aramaic Gospel-Sources 55
Archæology, Recent Biblical 122, 272, 323, 422, 556
,, Lachish Letters 380
,, New Finds in Egypt 323
Armistice 35
Atheism 191
Atonement 3, 289, 292, 385
Authority 435
Baptism 346
Beauty 48
Bereavement 381
Bible, Authority 231
,, and the Reformation 246
Brotherhood 431
Buddhism 433
Calvin 509
Cause 241
Chester Beatty Papyrus 235
Christ, Cosmic Significance of 4
,, Historical Reality 6, 48
,, and Salvation 7
,, Sufferings 290
,, Temptations 229
Christian Experience 3
,, Faith and Freedom 59
,, ,, Rational, Realist, and Redemptive 1
,, Year in Worship 310
Christianity Absoluteness 434
,, in Action 59, 136, 164, 200, 329
,, Failure 97, 99, 389
,, Finality 433
,, in Germany 408
,, and Totalitarianism 98, 100
Church of England Doctrine 238
,, in Germany 408
,, Living 1
,, Reunion 531
,, and Social Services 200
,, ,, State in the Apologists 360
,, Unity 193
Churchgoing 286
Colossians, Message of 3
Common-place, Wonder in 431
Communism 60, 98, 100, 146, 195
Community 51, 148, 327
Comparison, Danger of 80
Conscience 342, 435
Consequences, Considering 39
Conversion 24, 199, 286
Creation 339
Cross 205, 289, 385
,, Sacrifice of 281
Cure of Souls 431
David 127

PAGE
Denney 552
Design in the World 340
Discontinuity in the Physical and Spiritual 22
Dogma not Dull 383
Early Church and Pacifism 504
Easter 317
Ecclesiasticus 37
Ecstasy 295
Egypt, New Finds in 323
Eternity 241
Ethics, Christian 39, 47, 200, 288, 328
Eucharist 291, 343, 391
Evangelism 98
Evolution 22, 245
Experience, Religious 49, 186
,, ,, Truth of 2
Faith, Hope, Love 428
,, Rational and Religious 312
Fall 244, 339
Fascism 60, 98, 100, 146, 195
Foreign Theology, Recent 41, 91, 183, 425, 470, 523
Forgiveness 245, 386
Form-Criticism 55, 338, 401, 485
Fourth Gospel 406
Freedom, Discipline of 280
Freud 293
Future Life 46, 96
Garvie, A. E. 285
Germany, Religion in 408
God, Love of 82
,, Nature of 50
,, Relevance of Belief in 483
,, Repudiating 191
,, Signposts to 434
Gospel Narratives, Authenticity 250, 337, 485
,, Social Implications of 194
,, Supra-Racial 419
Grace 245
Healing 237
Hell, Problem of 527
Hinduism 433
History 242, 388, 434
Holiness 198, 374
Holy Spirit in the N.T. 196, 373
Humility 328
Huxley, Aldous 382
Importunity 436
Incarnation 340
Individual, Christianity and the 47
,, and Society 51
,, Worth of 53
Individualism 149
Intercession 87
Islam 433
James, Epistle of 181
Jesus and the Individual 53
Jewish Problem 541
Jonah, Book of 487
Jung 293
Kingdom of God 147, 291, 387

PAGE
Kingdom of God and Political Theory 194
Lachish Letters 380
Last Supper 292, 342
League of Nations 349
Life, Purpose of 340
,, and Work Conference 91
Lord's Supper 291, 346
Love 428
Man, Christian Doctrine of 244
Manna 95
Miracles of Christ 243
Missions 193
,, Best Books on 9
,, Christian Message 529
,, Failures of 454
Natural Religion 434
Nature 434
New Psychology 292
New Testament, Value of 456
Noah 190
Old Texts in Modern Translations 20, 72, 102, 186, 204, 269, 325
Oxford Group 253, 329, 442
Pacifism 349, 504
Palestine, Holy Places in 287
Parable of the Importunate Seeker 436
,, ,, ,, Pearl Merchant 142
,, ,, ,, Unjust Steward 234
Pastor 335
Pastoral Epistles, Scripture Quotations in 94
Paul 3
Peace 349
Personal Evangelism 100
Peter 243
Prayer 2, 53, 96, 134, 269, 371
,, Essence of 146
,, Intercessory 87
Preaching, Importance of 478
,, and the Individual 47
,, Sensational 383
Q 251, 337, 401
Rationalism 389
Reformation and the English Bible 246
Religious Experience, Validity 2, 49
,, Thought, Freedom and Tradition in 168
Return to God 197
Revelation, Views of 101
Sabbath, Scottish 432
Sacraments and Worship 391
'Saint' 198
Science and History 242
,, ,, Religion 241, 249, 252
Self-Deification 240
Sermon 239
,, Place of, in Worship 264
Sheppard, H. R. L. 164, 192, 384
Sin 244
Society and the Individual 51
Son of Man 291

PAGE
Streeter, B. H. 249
Strength, Sacredness 30
Suffering 319
Supra-Racial Gospel 419
Swords, Enigma of 467
Symbolism in Religion 344, 481
Testimony in the Gospels 401
Theological Movements 168
,, Thought, Basic Forms of 5
Theology, Return of, to the Church 218
PAGE
Time and Eternity 241, 339
Totalitarianism 98, 100, 146, 195, 532
Truth 48
Unity, Christian 28, 193
Virgin Birth 238
Virginibus Puerisque 26, 77, 125, 174, 223, 275, 315, 366, 411, 459, 513, 559
War 349
Wealth, Stewardship of 136
Whitham, A. E.
Witnessing
Word of God a Necessity
Work
Worship
,, Basis of
,, Christian Year in
,, Fellowship in
,, Place of Sermon in
,, and Sacraments
,, Symbolism in

BOOKS.

PAGE
Adam, Origin of Heathendom 161
Age of Transition 14
Alexander, A Priest for Ever 211
Andrews, India and the Pacific 115
Angell, Peace with the Dictators 547
Anson, Looking Forward 525
Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus 115
Arnold, Der Ursprung des christlichen Abendmahls 427
Aveling, Psychology 19
Barker, It Began in Galilee 262
Barr, Diagram of Synoptic Relationships 451
Barry, What has Christianity to Say? 97
Barth, The Church and the Churches 193, 211
,, Dogmatics 376
Bell, The Qur'ān, i. 299
Bellhouse, Thinking It Out 384
Bett, Spirit of Methodism 13
Bevan, Symbolism and Belief 481
Bezzant, Aspects of Belief 244, 254
Blinzler, Die Neutestamentlichen Berichte über die Verklärung Jesu 426
Bodgener, A Man Praying 262
Braham, Personality in Philosophical Theology 70
Bready, England: Before and After Wesley 498
Brightman, Future of Christianity 64
Brown, The Minister 145
Buber, I and Thou 17
Büchsel, Theologie des Neuen Testaments² 427
Cadoux, Ancient Smyrna 448
Caiger, The O.T. and Modern Discovery 397
Children of Light 451
Clarke, First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians 163
Codex Sinaiticus 548
Colwell, Study of the Bible 69
Contact of Pharisaism with Other Cultures 157
Cook, The "Truth" of the Bible 496
Cooke, Ezekiel 13
Craig, University Sermons 212
Crook, The Bible 303
Crow, I Speak for the Chinese 259
PAGE
D'Arcy, Christian Morals 71
Deane, Development of the Supernatural in Human Experience 451
Dewar, What is the Purpose of Life? 340
Dickie, Revelation and Response 433, 448
Doctrine in the Church of England 238, 255
Doctrine of the Holy Spirit 196
Drummond, Edward Irving 159
Easton and Robbins, The Eternal Word 162
Ehrenström, Christian Faith and the Modern State 309
Eisler, Enigma of the Fourth Gospel 449
Elliott-Binns, England and the New Learning 161
England, Validity of Religious Experience 50
English Bible, ed. Storr 452
Essentials of Life and Thought 211
Falconer, The Pastoral Epistles 66
Finkelstein, Siphre zu Deuteronomium 523
Firman-Edwards, The Road That Was Made 305
Fleming, Prayers for Every Day 398
Fosdick, Successful Christian Living 210
Frere, The Anaphora 359
Frick, The Gospel 357
Frost, Saint John of the Cross 160
,, The Love of God 306
Galling, Biblisches Reallexikon 42
Gardner-Smith, The Christ of the Gospels 342
Garrard, Duty and the Will of God 500
Garvie, Memories and Meanings 285
Gemser, Sprüche Salomes 42
Gerstenmaier, Kirche, Volk u. Staat 91
,, Die Kirche u. die Schöpfung 333
Golding, In the Steps of Moses 94
Goodspeed, Introduction to the N.T. 65
Goudge, Church of England and Reunion 531
Graveson, Religion and Culture
Green, The Christian Man
Hahn, Das Mitsterben u. Mitauferstehen mit Christus bei Paulus
Hanukkah
Harkness, Recovery of Ideals
Harris, Unholy Pilgrimage
Harrison, Arminianism
,, Son to Susanna
Hartill, Pacifism
Hastings, Speaker's Bible, xxviii.
Haverford Symposium on Archæology
Heiler, Prayer
Heimann, Indian and Western Philosophy
Henson, Ad Clerum
Herbert, The Ayes Have It
Héring, Le Royaume de Dieu
Herklots, The Yoke of Christ
Hicks, Critical Realism
Hobson, Confessions of an Economic Heretic 389,
Holmes-Gore, New Morals for Old
Holt, Unitarian Contribution to Social Progress in England
Hope, Distinctive Elements in Christianity
Hoskyns, Cambridge Sermons
Hough, The Civilized Mind 3,
Hudson and Reckitt, The Church and the World, i.
Hulbert-Powell, Wettstein
Hunkin, The Mercy of God
Husain, Dogmatic and Mystical Theology of John Donne
Ibn Shâhîn, Studies in Islam and Judaism
Jacks, The Stolen Sword
Jones, Christ and Present World Issues
,, Herods of Judæa
,, The Eternal Gospel
Jordan, Development of Religious Toleration in England
Judaism and Christianity, 2 vols. 14,
Keay, History of Syrian Church in India
Kendall, Modern Introduction to the N.T.

PAGE
Kennedy, The God Whom We Ignore 355
Keyserling, Immortality . 258
Kingdom of God and History 387
Kirche, Staat u. Mensch . 92
Kirk, Romans 162
Knox and Vidler, The Gospel of God 158
Knudson, Validity of Religious Experience 2
Köberle, Das Evangelium u. die Rätsel der Geschichte . 472
Kotsuji, Semitic Alphabets . 307
Kraemer, Christian Message in a Non-Christian World . 529
Kümmel, Die Eschatologie der Evangelien 183
Lake, Introduction to the N.T. 353
Lambert, Traité de Grammaire Hébraïque . . 470
Landau, Beiträge zum Chazarenproblem 523
Langer, Introduction to Symbolic Logic 159
Levertoff, The Wailing Wall . 208
Lewis, Saul of Tarsus . . 120
Lightfoot, Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels . . 395
Lincoln, Some Political and Social Ideas of English Dissent 304
Lindsay, John Bunyan . 155
Lippmann, The Good Society 194
Lloyd, The Beloved Community . . . 51
,, Revolutionary Religion 308
Loewenich, Johanneisches Denken 183
Lombardi, Kierkegaard . 473
Luccock, Christianity and the Individual 47
Lyon, Religious Liberty in England, 1603–39 . . 264
Macaulay, Death of Jesus . 353
Macgregor, Christ and the Church . . 117
,, The N.T. Basis of Pacifism . . 447
Mackintosh, Sermons . . 449
Maillard, Disciples of Jesus . 262
Malden, Authority of the N.T. 72
Marmorstein, Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God . . 161
Marston, The Bible Comes Alive 111
Martindale, Does God Matter for Me ? 18
Masaryk, Modern Man and Religion 499
Mathews, India Reveals Herself 112
Matthews, Signposts to God . 434
Maycock, Nicholas Ferrar . 450
Mills, The Rengma Nagas . 158
Moffatt, First Five Centuries of the Church . 301
,, First Epistle to the Corinthians . . 545
Möller, Biblische Theologie des A.T. 524

PAGE
Morey, Bartholomew of Exeter 209
Mottram, Noah 190
Mowinckel, Two Sources of Predeuteronomic Primeval History (JE) in Gen 1–11 . 257
Mozley, William Tyndale . 18
Murray, Obedience of the Cross 385
Niebuhr, Beyond Tragedy . 339
Nock, St. Paul 354
Noel, Life of Jesus . 116, 147
Northridge, The O.T. To-day 119
Oesterley, Sacrifices in Ancient Israel . . 110
,, Ancient Hebrew Poems . . 400
O'Leary, Saints of Egypt . 163
Oppermann, English Missionaries in Sweden . . 163
Otto, Kingdom of God . 291, 299
Pauley, Candle of the Lord . 208
Peake, Recollections and Appreciations . . . 358
Philip, Christianity and Present Day International Relations 532
Phillips, Hymnody Past and Present 210
Phythian-Adams, The Fulness of Israel 256
Quick, Doctrines of the Creed 483, 493
Rae, The Bible Teacher's Difficulties 122
Raven, War and the Christian 447
Raven and Heath, One Called Help 68
Rawlinson, The Church and the Challenge of To-day . 71
Reckitt, Religion in Social Action 494
Reeves, Recent Psychic Experiences . . . 18
Rehm, Textkritische Untersuchungen zu den Parallelstellen der Samuel-Königsbücher u. der Chronik . 185
Revelation 101
Richardson, Gospels in the Making . . 337
,, The Church Through the Centuries . 502
Riddell, Why Did Jesus Die ? 289
Robertson, Religion and the Totalitarian State . . 15
Rudolph, Der ,, Elohist " . 524
Russell, Healing in His Wings 120
Schachner, Mediæval Universities 499
Schofield, Historical Background of the Bible . . 396
Schonfield, Hebrews . . 306
Scott, Validity of the Gospel Record 485
Scott-Craig, Christian Attitudes to War and Peace . 447
Seeberg, Wer ist Christus ? . 333
Selwyn, The White Horseman 478

PAGE
Shepherd, Children of the Veld 239
Simpson, The Redeemer . 114
Smith, Elements of Comparative Theology . 160
,, Parables of the Synoptic Gospels . . 113
Soares, Three Typical Beliefs 69
Solovyev, God, Man, and the Church 305
Spurr, Evangelism for our Time 99
Stadener, Mannen och gärningen 473
Steinheim, Vom Bleibenden u. Vergänglichen im Judentum 426
Steinilber-Oberlin, Buddhist Sects of Japan. . . 258
Stewart, Gates of New Life . 256
Stocks, Time, Cause, and Eternity 241
Stolz, Psychology of Religious Living 117
Storr, The Light of the Bible 452
Straub, Die Bildersprache des Apostels Paulus . . 333
Stuart, Achievement of Personality 292
Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice 64
Temple, Christian Democracy 19
,, Basic Convictions . 53
Titius, Beiträge zur Religionsphilosophie . . . 425
Torczyner, Lachish I . . 380
Torrance, Expository Studies in St. John's Miracles . 452
Totaler Staat u. christliche Freiheit, 1937 . . . 91
Toyne, The New Testament. 15
Underhill, Saint Peter . . 243
,, Mystery of Sacrifice 263
Union of Christendom, ed. Mackenzie . . . 453
Valentine, Treatment of Moral and Emotional Difficulties . 309
Vann, Morals Makyth Man . 399
Weiss, History of Primitive Christianity . . . 207
Weske, Convocation of the Clergy 113
Whale, What is a Living Church ? . . . 1
,, The Christian Faith . 436
Whately, The Focus of Belief 301
Whiteley, Wesley's England 495
Whitham, Discipline and Culture of Spiritual Life. . 430
Williams, How I Found My Faith . . . 432, 477
Winter, Sifra 523
Wood, Henry T. Hodgkin . 143
World's Economic Future . 397
Wotherspoon, What Happened at Pentecost . . . 260
Wünsch, Evangelische Ethik des Politischen . . . 41
Zöllner u. Stählin, Die Kirche Jesu Christi . . . 42

HEBREW WORDS.

	PAGE
אבי עד	142
אֲדִין	57
אֵימָה	525
בַּיִת	38
זִמְרָה	189
חַד	57
חומר	38
חלק	38
כָּל־קֳבֵיל	57
מָה	57
מנוח	39
נגה	39
עָזִּי	189
קפץ	37
שנה	38
תומך	39

GREEK WORDS.

	PAGE
ἀλλὰ τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι (Ro 16¹)	430
ἐζωγρημένοι (2 Ti 2²⁶)	45
εἰ μὴ εἷς Θεός (Mk 2⁷ 10¹⁸)	363
ἐποίει (Mk 6²⁰)	93
ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν (Lk 17²¹)	147, 476
ἠπόρει (Mk 6²⁰)	93
κύριος and *ὁ κύριος*	183
νόμος and *ὁ νόμος*	183
οἶκος and *οἰκία*	566
πάντα στέγει . . . πάντα ὑπομένει (1 Co 13⁷)	430
συνεργῶ (Ro 8²⁸)	475

TEXTS.

	PAGE
Gn i.	568
iii.	244
xiii. 3, 4	520
xxvi. 7–11	236
xlix. 10	142
Ex xv. 2	189
xx. 9	369
Lv xxvi. 4	460
Nu x. 29–32	20
Dt xxxii. 25	525
2 S i. 23	77
1 K iii. 5	275
2 K v. 12	518
Neh iv. 10	559
vi. 3	460
Ps xlvi. 10	27
lv. 6	465
lvi. 6	316
lvii. 10	131
lxii. 11	126
lxxxv. 8	179
cxxiv. 1	414
cxxx. 1, 2	226
Ec v. 9	560
xii. 1	223
Pr ix. 10	515
Is lxv. 11	102
lxv. 25	528
Jer ii. 21	77
xlv. 4, 5	204
Ezk i. 28	30
ii. 1	30
iii. 15	516
Dn vi. 10	26
Hos iv. 6	464
Hos vi. 6	464
Hag ii. 3, 9	80
Mt v. 38, 39	47
v. 41	563
v. 47	565
v. 48	198
vi. 7	371
vi. 10	54, 387
vi. 11	560
vi. 31	412
vii. 6	86
viii. 8–13	490
x. 41	432
xi. 5–9	436
xi. 25–27	236
xi. 28–30	416
xi. 29	280
xii. 3	127
xiii. 45, 46	78, 142
xiv. 25–31	243
xiv. 28, 29	224
xvi. 15–18	490
xvi. 18	243
xviii. 17	43
xx. 28	385
xxv. 45	521
xxvii. 48f.	283
xxviii. 20	84
Mk ii. 7	363
v. 9	175
v. 28	321
vi. 5	418
vi. 20	93
x. 18	363
x. 45	281
Mk xii. 30	459
xiv. 36	54
Lk ii. 12	129
ix. 59	177
x. 18	291
x. 21, 22	236
xi. 1	134
xiii. 34	418
xv. 6, 9, 24	32
xvi. 1 ff.	234
xvii. 21	147, 476
xix. 9, 10	490f.
xxii. 35–38	467
xxiii. 42, 43	490, 492
xxiv. 35	186
Jn i. 1	434
i. 1–14	568
iii. 16	82, 125
iv. 35	560
iv. 44	92, 236, 429
v. 39	366
viii. 12	367
ix. 25	50
xv. 13	514
xvi. 12	418
xvii. 20–22	28
xix.14	343
Ro vi. 13	235
viii. 28	474
viii. 37	318
xii. 16	430
xii. 19	559
1 Co i. 10	72
xi. 24	343
xiii. 7	430
1 Co xiii. 13	428
xv. 20	317
xv. 49	315
2 Co iii. 17	373
v. 1	47
v. 4	276
v. 19	3
vi. 4–10	339
Gal vi. 2, 5	411
vi. 14	562
Ph i. 27	325
i. 29	319
ii. 15	223
iii. 20	33
iv. 6, 7	269
iv. 7, 8	368
2 Ti ii. 26	45
He iv. 15	229
vi. 1	133
vi. 9	513
xi. 39 f.	35
1 P i. 8, 9	175
ii. 21–25	278
iii. 9	278
iv. 7	278
v. 2	278
v. 5	278
1 Jn iv. 16	227
iv. 20	413
v. 11	276
Rev. iii. 20	180
iv. 8	374
xix. 11	462
xxi. 13	141

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

We earnestly hope that the course of events in the Far East will permit the holding of the projected meeting of the International Missionary Council next year in Hangchow. If, as we trust, it does meet, it will be a singularly interesting, impressive, and challenging assemblage; for the delegates sent from Asia and Africa will slightly outnumber those from Europe and America. It reminds us forcibly that the world is one as never before, and that Christianity is a world-religion as never before.

The questions which are being studied with a view to the meeting are big questions about the Faith and the Church in action. Principal J. S. Whale was asked to write something which might be informative and stimulative of interest in next year's proceedings. The learned Principal disclaims very modestly any special equipment which would enable him to speak on the Church in Asia; but he is rightly persuaded that, however different externals may be in Asia, in India, or China, the Church in every land is faced with fundamentally the same task.

So he has set down some very important considerations in a little book which is entitled *What is a Living Church?* (Edinburgh House Press; 1s. net). That, it seems to us, was the big question to which all the discussions at Edinburgh this autumn pointed. And that is the question of which all the proposed agenda for Hangchow present different aspects.

What, then, is a living Church? According to Principal Whale it is revealed to the world and stands forth by its faith, its worship, its witness, and its action.

'Living Christianity is what it has ever been, a believing Christianity.' 'The New Testament is never wistful; it rings with a note of solemn joyous certainty.' 'Conviction is the presupposition and *raison d'être* of the Gospel.' And first and last Christian belief is belief in the living God who has revealed Himself to man. Then there is belief about sin. Then belief in Jesus Christ our Lord, this last being 'the vital heart of our faith.' Then there is belief in the Church catholic and evangelical as 'the sacred gift of God—a wonderful and sacred mystery, the great company of the elect of God stretching beyond the sight of any man across the centuries and the continents.'

In face of the doubts expressed as to this faith it is argued that the Christian faith is rational, realist, and redemptive. No Barthian need shudder at 'rational' as Dr. Whale uses the term. He means merely that the Christian faith answers in a way which nowise offends reason—the questions which a serious reasonable man is compelled to raise. By 'realism' he means that the Christian religion deals with man as he really is, not sentimentalized; it deals honestly and fairly with sin and man's inability to help himself. It opposes the optimistic humanism which came to its climax in the Great War. Against the ideology of Fascism or Communism, Christianity, like every living religion, holds up redemption, and believes it knows the secret in 'the Word of God coming from eternity into time and in terms of time, in judgment and sovereign grace.'

Let us pass to the searching sections on witnessing. 'Vital Christianity,' says Dr. Whale, 'is necessarily a witnessing Christianity.' 'Real religion is always enthusiastic and propagandist.' 'Our faith is not safe, nor is it real faith, unless we find it so precious that we cannot keep it to ourselves, and unless we realize that religious individualism is a contradiction in terms.' 'The religion which a man cherished in his bosom and kept to himself would not be religion but religiosity, and even religious fellowship which he enjoyed with a coterie of like-minded friends—carefully selected people of his own class or culture—would not be religious fellowship but mere gregariousness. He only begins to understand the Gospel when he understands that it is God's Good News for all sorts and conditions of men, and cries, Woe is me if I do not preach it. Unless we are ambassadors for the faith we are not holding the faith.'

We have to witness to ourselves, to children, and to the great multitude everywhere which is largely pagan. The call to witness begins at home. If our witness to the world is to be effectual and convincing we must look first and last and all the time to ourselves. A renewal of vital religion in the world must begin among professed Christians. What is the way of renewal ?—Prayer. Multitudes in our time have ceased to pray, and when praying ends, paganism and practical materialism begin. The deadliest enemy of religion is not doctrinaire atheism in Russia, but the practical atheism nearer home which 'neither denies nor affirms, but just ignores.'

The religious inner life of the Church depends on the religious life of the home, and *vice versâ*. 'If there is no regular and real prayer in private and in the family, if our homes are not places where prayer is wont to be made ; if there is no private and diligent study of the Bible whereby men search the Scriptures and find in them the fount of divine wisdom—little wonder that many a church service seems weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable, and that no effective progress is made in the ordinary Christian group to grow in the knowledge of the living God. Public worship thus degenerates into the likeness of a public meeting (without its possible liveliness) and the result is dreariness and spiritual death.'

It is interesting to find Dr. WHALE strongly disposed to recommend the formations of *ecclesiolas in ecclesiis*—the experiment of small or large groups within the congregation that would meet for prayer and the study of the Word. 'Their life together in the intimacy of prayer and consecration would be a vicarious priesthood, convincing others, subduing them to the same contrition, and drawing them into the same fellowship of renewal.'

Dean Albert C. KNUDSON, of Boston University School of Theology, is not so well known on this side of the Atlantic as he ought to be. His books are a credit to the theological scholarship of American Methodism, and are to be commended for the clearness of their expositions and the soundness of their judgments. They furnish notable contributions not only in the field of Old Testament Theology, but also in that of Systematic Doctrine. Nor has the philosophical basis of theology been neglected by him. He has now followed up his defence of personalistic theism with an able plea for *The Validity of Religious Experience* (Abingdon Press ; $2.00).

It is a timely work, and has been written in full view of recent discussions in America and Britain. The only criticism of it we would offer is that it does not appear to move so freely and independently among contemporary writings in this field as one might have expected. Dr. KNUDSON is so experienced a writer and has established so secure a place for himself in the theological world that he might safely have paid less homage to other writers than himself.

A discussion of the nature of religious experience leads to the main part of the work, in which are examined the various grounds for believing in the truth or validity of religious experience. To this question there are three chief answers. One emphasizes the immediacy of religious experience, another its value, and another its principle of self-verification. These three answers are subjected to a careful examination, and the conclusion is stated that the ultimate basis for belief in religious experience as valid is to be found, not in its immediacy, nor in its practical utility, but in the native religious endowment of the human spirit. It is argued that religion is structural in the human mind, and as such has logically as valid a basis as has philosophy, or morality, or art. Like those other phases of experience it verifies itself, and no profounder validation is possible.

For the exposition of these views reference must be made to the pages of the work itself. We would now draw attention to the last of its five chapters, which deals with the specific Christian experience, as distinguished from religious experience in general. Here the same appeal is made to man's religious nature. Like other religions Christianity is validated by the common religious reason. The Christian type of experience professes to be no more than the purest and most highly developed form of religious experience. 'Christ would mean nothing to us unless there were already within us a native yearning after the divine.'

We shall not pause to indicate in detail how obnoxious such doctrine is to the Barthian theology. We go on to say that Dr. **Knudson** prefaces his treatment of the most significant elements of Christian experience with a reference to its uniqueness. A deep consciousness of sin, a profound belief in the divine grace, and a strong spirit of hope appear in other religions of the 'prophetic' type (as distinct from the 'mystical'), but in Christianity they have received a unique development, and they are basic to the framework of the Christian life.

But the most distinctive element in the unique Christian experience is the experient's sense of personal relationship to Christ. The mystical consciousness of being united to Christ in a direct personal relation is involved even in the sense of the Divine Presence. God comes to the Christian as the God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ. Christ and Deity are for the Christian indissolubly linked together. God is for the Christian a Christlike God. And the profoundest Christian thought of Christ is that God was in Him reconciling the world unto Himself.

That God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself is indeed a presupposition of Christian experience. If less than this were affirmed with reference to Christ, Christian experience would lose its distinctive character. But how to conceive of the presence of God in Christ is one of the most perplexing questions that have engaged the attention of Christian thinkers. It should be observed, however, that Christian experience is not concerned with the mode of the Divine immanence or the method of the reconciliation. All that Christian experience is concerned with is the fact of Christ, the fact of His unique relation to God, the fact of His reconciling activity.

'If God was actually in Him reconciling the world unto Himself, we need nothing more. That is sufficient ground for assigning to Him the position of Divine leadership which He has occupied in Christian experience from the beginning.'

Dr. Lynn Harold **Hough** includes in his book of essays—*The Civilized Mind*—one on 'The Message of Colossians,' which is a quite brilliant piece of exposition. He compares Paul, immured in his prison in Rome, with Sir Walter Raleigh, who, during his twelve years of confinement in the Tower of London, wrote his famous 'History of the World.' Both were daring men of action, hungering for commanding achievement in the world. Both had a large capacity for brooding thought, and to both prison brought an opportunity for the high adventures of the mind which would scarcely have been found in any other way.

Paul's experience of travel and contact with men in the Roman Empire had affected his mind profoundly. He was constantly receiving benefits from the Pax Romana. And more and more this vast organization of the life of civilized man impressed him as something beneficent. Roman engineering, Roman law, and the Roman spirit evidenced the strength, vigour, and vast serviceableness of the imperial régime. And so his thought tended to become more and more imperial. If a human institution could be made so potent a force for good, what might not the Christian religion achieve for bringing unity and coherence to the life of man.

And it was the busy life of men, their keen and turbulent thoughts, their moral battles and spiritual possibilities which most stirred Paul. Unlike Wordsworth, he was not aroused to spiritual understanding by the lonely silences of Nature. He was more interested in people than in things. No impulse from the vernal wood had anything to say to him about moral evil or good. And therefore it was in a city like Rome that he felt himself most profoundly moved. His thoughts were stirred to vividness and imaginative splendour when he felt the throb of life in the world's metropolis around him. The enforced quiet of his prison life only emancipated his mind and gave his imagination wings.

At the time at which Paul arrived in Rome things were altering for the worse. Nero's five benignant years of rule were giving way to the period of wild and cruel ferocity. Paul had confidently expected justice in the court of the Emperor, but that dream was rudely dispelled, and he was forced back on the sources of comfort and courage in his own faith. At the same time he received word from Epaphras of the quaint heresies that were invading the Colossian Church, heresies which, above all, were a lowering of the dignity and saving power of Christ, and the substitution of various intermediaries.

It was under this double stimulus that there came to him that wonderful conception of the 'Cosmic Christ.' In Him all things were created. In Him 'we must seek for the ultimate meaning of the world.' He is all and in all, everything and in everything. This is the highest flight of Paul's imperial vision. It is clear that he could never regard the religions of the world as on one level, each with some contribution to make to the final religion which is a synthesis of them all. He was certain that the Christian religion was not an aspect of man's quest for God, but was God's quest for men, God in action in Jesus Christ for the remaking of human life. This was the deep source of Paul's life.

His message in Colossians is that Christ is the very secret of the life of the universe. And the Church of twenty centuries is especially with Paul at this point. If the Christian Church should ever forget that in Christ God comes into human life as He comes in no other person, in no other place, in no other way, the day of creative power for the Christian religion would come to an end. So Paul believed, and this is the heart of what he was saying to the Colossians.

It is essentially characteristic of this Epistle that all its practical suggestions about personal and family and social virtue are deeply related to Paul's vision of the finality of Christ. His spirit is to control all the activities of men, as it masters the world of creation and the vast and impalpable regions beyond. The vision of His universal significance is to change men's attitude towards all processes of thought and all human relationships. The vision of the cosmic significance of Christ which transfigured a prisoner's life for Paul was to transform the thought and life of Christian men everywhere.

This, then, is the message of the Epistle to the Colossians. Only a transcendent Christ can meet the need of this strange creature, man. There are, as we have seen, strands in this cord of faith. It is better to say there were currents of influence leading Paul inevitably towards this faith. His sensitiveness to the imperial idea, the sufferings that threw him back on himself and made him ask what it was on which he leant, and the challenge offered by the weird heresies at Colosse. And the issue in his soul was this dominant claim for his Saviour. It is a tremendous claim, but it is the faith by which the Christian Church lives. Whenever the Church is fully conscious of its high calling it rises to the Alpine heights where everything else becomes insignificant in the light of the cosmic significance of Christ.

The Basic Forms of Theological Thought.

By Professor Karl Barth, Basel, Switzerland.

I understand by the forms of theological thought the area, so to speak, within which theological thought moves, the necessity and limitation within which it moves, and also its freedom. The 'basic forms' are those which are valid as necessitating, limiting, and liberating factors in theology universally and without exception, whatever historical and individual differences may exist. The basic forms of theological thought which I would like to survey are therefore what might be called the constitutional principles of theology.

Any one who is a theologian in the narrower sense of the word should possess special clarity with regard to these. Further, all those others who would like to be convinced, responsible, and active members of the Church in other respects, cannot but see how desirable it would be to possess a certain amount of knowledge in this connexion also. Further, there is the man who is accustomed from a distance to frame his own thoughts about the Church and theology either in a friendly or unfriendly spirit and who occasionally gives utterance to these thoughts. Should he not in so doing require himself to run his eye over what theology actually is, and what in essentials may and may not be expected from it? It cannot be said of us theologians ourselves that we always possess such clarity and spread it. Even in circles sincerely and joyfully attached to the Church there are too few who recognize these constitutional principles and who can, for instance, understand a sermon, or participate in a theological discussion, or judge the problems of a Church situation in a worthy and competent manner. And competence, based upon a knowledge of these points, is an even more rare occurrence among those who stand outside the Church.

What is the reason for this? In reply, people often refer to the supposed trade secrets of theology, which every man cannot be expected to know and use. It cannot be disputed that in theology as in all paths of life there is a definite technique which as such can as a rule only be the concern of theologians in the narrower sense of the word. It is not with this technique, however, that we are here concerned, but with the knowledge of the basic forms which belong as properly to theological thought as do, for instance, their equivalents to technical, commercial, educational, athletic, and political thought. Let me draw your attention now to a fact which is surely remarkable. People feel it at least a defect and a regrettable lack that they have to admit that in so many spheres they are strangers to the very presuppositions which are there perfectly clear. In theology, on the other hand, people have no hesitation in confessing almost with emphasis their lack of understanding of the very fundamental principles, and they justify themselves by that reference to theological technique which, as we have seen, will not bear closer inspection. To this extent they confess to an utterly miserable dilettantism. It is remarkable also that the oft-cited lack of unity among theologians themselves plays so important a part in the imagination of widely spread circles. Many people seem almost to take a pleasure in proving the existence of this disunity and likewise in assigning it as the reason why men decide to save themselves the trouble of examining even the fundamental principles in theology, or of taking up a definite position towards them. But this is what is required unconditionally in other spheres, where peace does not exist any more than in theology, and it is required all the more, the more important these spheres are for life. And this is the case even when men confess that the competence with which they do so leaves much to be desired. Why is this not expected also in theology? What is the reason that precisely in regard to theology there is so much satisfaction, or at least supposed satisfaction, with catchwords which lie fatally ready to hand and with conceptions which are only too obscure? Perhaps I may be permitted to leave this question to the close, so that I may first give some account of the subject itself.

Theological thought, like all orderly human thought, receives its basic forms from its object. It is by its object that it is first and foremost awakened and rendered possible: by it, it is claimed, employed, and requisitioned; by it, given form and order and stamped as theological thought. It is therefore thought which, possessed of all freedom—otherwise it would not be thought—is not accidental or arbitrary but determined and limited from without; that is, it is thought determined and limited by its object. It can be none the less very varied thought as it is conditioned in one way or another by the various ages with their particular destinies, problems, and presuppositions, and, above all, by the infinite variety of human individuality. Thus it is secured from ever being a uniform type of thought. It is more important, however, to consider the other fact, that it is never on that account abandoned to the spirit of the various ages, or to the disposal of the individual, but beyond these, its alterable conditions, it is subject to another unalterable order. Theology cannot let any final pronouncement be made to it by these its alterable conditions; it cannot permit its basic forms to be given it from that source. To the extent in which it would do this, it would inevitably become bad theology. And if it became incapable of resisting these alterable conditions, and if it really and finally evaded the limitations and restraints imposed upon it by its object, it would thereby inevitably cease to be theology. The unalterable order to which it is subject is the order imposed by its object. In all this, theological thought differs in nothing from all other orderly human thought. Much would have been achieved if every one had recognized as obvious that theological thought, just like medical or military or artistic thought, possesses an objectivity which is imposed upon it. In spite of all incidental movement within its bounds, it cannot depart from this objectivity, if it is to avoid becoming bad theology, and if it is not to surrender itself totally.

We come now to the object of theological thought from which it receives its basic forms. It is at this point that it has to go its own way. Its object is the reality on which the Christian Church is founded, the reality which forms the content of its life and the substance of its message. Its object is the man Jesus Christ present here to-day, as He was yesterday, through the Holy Spirit in the witness of the Old and New Testaments. It is God Himself in His truth, that is in His revelation—the God who reveals and judges man's sin, takes it upon Himself and forgives it, the God who gives man the hope of eternal life and in doing so takes man into His service. Such is the object by which theological thought has been awakened and rendered possible, the stamp of which it must bear in all circumstances. Theological thought is the thought of the Church; it is the thought which the Church must continually occupy itself with; it is its origin and essence. Everything else, whether it be the method of theological thought, its language, or the piety bound up with it, has from the beginning changed and will change again. But there must not be a single iota of change in the impression stamped on it by its object Jesus Christ, the Word of God, as He is witnessed to in the Bible, and in this sense not an iota of change in the attachment of theology to the Church. It is only a bad theology, one which is degenerating into a lack of theology, which would want to change anything here. You may deny the reality of theology, but you cannot demand from it that, in this fundamental relationship to its object, it should be anything else than that which it alone can be. And it is impossible to understand why theology should not make this state of affairs clear in a way which limits it much more closely, or why it should not confess to this relationship much more frankly than it has generally done in recent times—and that neglect has not been for its salvation.

Jesus Christ, the object of theological thought, is a historical reality—indeed, a historical reality witnessed to in definite documents, those of the Bible. In the same Gospel in which it is written that the Word became flesh, He has called Himself the Way. Therefore theological thought must not stray across country but keep to the way. It must assume the form of Biblical exposition. It has no choice in the matter because it is determined and limited by its historical, and historically attested, object. It cannot free itself from history and construct itself from its own resources. Equally it cannot be free thought and occupy itself with some other piece of history. Equally too, as it occupies itself with this particular piece of history, it cannot maintain its hold on any other documents. As theological thought it can only be exposition of the Bible. It may be instructed by Church History only because, and so far as, the latter is the history of previous Biblical exposition—history which is most certainly highly instructive both positively and negatively. The task of Biblical exposition consists in making heard the witness to Jesus Christ, once uttered and written down as such, and in making it heard to-day as a voice speaking from that time. In this form theological thought distinguishes itself from empty conceptual thought, from the speculations of all self-elected and self-righteous types of piety, and from the arbitrary gnosis of so-called *Weltanschauungen*. In this form it is always fresh, original, fruitful, animated, and animating. In this form it serves the Church, and through the Church the World. The Church lives by the remembrance of that time when it came into being. It is that time which directs and corrects her, which leads and preserves her, and which for that very reason wishes ever anew to be expressed. If theology becomes untrue, even for a moment, to that time, if it preaches a 'to-day' in abstraction from that time, and if it wishes to be more than exposition, it will without any doubt become bad theology.

Jesus Christ, the object of theological thought, is also the truth, and truth means revelation, that is, the authoritative differentiation of the light from the darkness. Theological thought must be therefore, in the second place, a differentiating, that is in Greek, a critical type of thought. It must distinguish between what it has learned from its documents and what the past, and especially the momentary present, has inserted or placed beside it out of its uncontrolled opinion. In the service of its object it must draw distinctions in what the Church of to-day thinks to be her message, distinguishing what pertains to this its object from what is foreign to it, and therefore distinguishing the divine majesty from the pseudo-majesties, well meant and less well meant, which seek to thrust themselves into the place of the former; and therefore it must separate truth from error and falsehood. Because theological thought fixes boundaries and therefore makes contours visible, it is for its time the seeing eye of the Church. It was certainly an unhappy innovation when theology viewed from this point of view began to be called systematic theology. Attempts at systematizing in the realm of theology have always been attempts to unite truth with error. Our task here is precisely the prevention of such attempts. The old name, controversial theology, was certainly more appropriate for the service of watchman which theology has to perform. For it actually has this controversial side. If this second form of theological thought were intentionally overlooked, the task of Biblical interpretation could well be misunderstood as a mere stocktaking of far-off bygone things. The place where a testimony to God's revelation ought to be expounded might be occupied by a purely historical treatment of the Bible and of Church History. This historical treatment might seem suspiciously poor in its collocation of undigested facts, and also suspiciously rich in its pompous parade as a history of the human mind. In both cases it gives rise to empty views.

The attitude of such historical treatment is one of neutrality to the question of truth, towards which revelation itself forbids us to take up an attitude of neutrality. When theological thought in its first form as exposition falls victim to such a disease, it is certainly not the fault of the real Bible or of real Church History. And let us not forget the other point either that theological thought in its second, that is, critical form would also have lost its character at once, if in this form it had sought to make itself independent; that is, if it had sought openly or secretly to obtain its criterion in any other way than through exposition of the Bible.

Jesus Christ is the life, that is to say, the actual salvation of the man who believes in Him. Therefore He forces theology, which is determined and limited by Him, inevitably to go beyond exposition and criticism and become proclamation. For this reason the ancients named the whole of theology *doctrina*, 'teaching.' By that they meant (in contrast to a later corrupt use of the word) precisely this, that theological thinking is a practical type of thinking, a type of thinking which applies to man and his real life, and may be therefore no merely contemplative abstract form of meditation. It is no thinking for thinking's sake, but thinking for the sake of responsibility, proclamation, confession, witness, consolation, and exhortation. The Church, whose thinking it is now, becomes visible as the community of believers who may and must hear ever and again that they are a community not lost but possessing eternal life. And the world now becomes visible as the world which in its confusion, perplexity, and subjection to death waits for the Word of God—for the Word that illuminates, points away and is full of hope. The thought of the theological critic and exegete must be of this kind as must the thought of those who, though not professionally theologians, are yet competent and willing to join in the work. Theological thought will always direct itself at first toward the thinker himself, but also secondly and immediately it will direct itself further towards one's neighbour. In this, the practical point of theology, it aims at faith, it inquires about faith, it invites men to have faith, it prays the Holy Spirit for true faith in the midst of that 'fellowship of saints' which is so called only because it is a fellowship in this petition. Thought which lacks this climax would from the very start fail to be theological thought. It is impossible to have exposition for the sake of exposition—an *explicatio* which from the very beginning does not compel an *applicatio*. Equally impossible here is criticism for the sake of criticism, criticism which would seek to deny for some other reason than for the sake of the unshaken affirmation which remains unimpaired. If exposition and criticism are sick—there are so many theological diseases—then they can and must become well again through the recollection of this their concrete task. The converse of this, however, ought not to be forgotten here. The practical point of theological thinking is clear-cut only where it is nourished and yet corrected by hard and serious endeavour after exposition and by a bitter struggle for the truth, as these two stand behind it in all their actuality. It trickles away in the sand, it can become rabid or dead or dangerous—this alleged Christian proclamation—where this background of patient inquiry into the text and indefatigable distinguishing of truth from falsehood is missing.

Let me say a word more about the freedom in which theological thought moves within the sphere of its necessity and limitation. The symmetry of these three basic forms in which I have presented the matter for the sake of a survey is something which in point of fact probably never occurs, and which indeed is probably never permitted to occur. It is not only permissible but required and in order, that theological thought in certain ages and individuals should take on more visibly and emphatically the character of exposition in order to accomplish certain tasks within the Church. In other ages and individuals it takes on the character of criticism, and in others that of proclamation. Theological thought possesses this freedom that it is permitted also to be one-sided. But this permission must not be without compulsion. Every case of one-sidedness must come into operation not as personal whim or desire, but as a gift and a commission. Therefore this freedom, too, must be in reality the royal freedom of the Word of God, and not one of the paltry attempts at freedom that man allows himself. The varieties of theological thought which rise out of this freedom must not be confused with the mutually exclusive antitheses between good theology and bad theology, or between theology and the lack of theology. For a variety based on obedience creates a richness which it is to be hoped the Church will not deplore but feel grateful for. Certainly people have often spoken of this richness where it was out of place to do so and where a struggle would have been better and more full of love than peace. A freedom to practise bad, that is, unbiblical, uncritical, or unpractical theology, or indeed freedom to practise something that is not theology at all, is out of the question in any intelligible sense of the term freedom. With what real right could this be seriously demanded? Or should the freedom to be unobjective, so properly refused in every other sphere of thought, exist in theology? Theology becomes bad or fails to be theology where the determining and limiting power of its object is forgotten or denied. Free speculation or a merely historical treatment stalk about as the one-sidedness permitted and required, and with them goes idle talk, arbitrary and foreign to the Church's task. Behind them all stands human caprice. In all these cases no one ought to marvel or be shocked, if there can be no peace there but rather warning and protest and, if necessary, strife. And whoever calls attention to the fact that the fellowship of the Church is endangered by all this should not be suspected as a disturber of the peace. Inside the freedom of theological thought the fellowship of the Church must be upheld whatever the price; outside this freedom it cannot be upheld at all. It is once more the object of theological thought itself which places it under this double law of freedom.

I promised at the beginning that at the close I would return to the question why it can happen that theological thought even among the theologians themselves is such a relatively rare thing. After what I have said, might I perhaps ask you if you are still of the opinion that, in trying to understand this type of thought, we are dealing with abnormally difficult problems, and if, finally, it has not become clear to you that the oft-cited strife among theologians themselves is significant and necessary, and that therefore it can be no reason for not co-operating in this type of thought? No, the really serious reason for not participating here, and therefore for remaining a mere dilettante in theologicis, lies in quite another direction and is quite well known to any one who has himself already tried to think theologically. It is, in fact, not so simple a matter to have anything to do with that decisive object of theological thought, to say nothing of letting oneself be influenced and led by it to however small an extent. The matter at stake here is lordship, complete obedience, life and death, the crossing of a Rubicon. For it is a matter of faith when we are dealing with Jesus Christ. Not every one can and may cross this Rubicon. No one—as the Bible makes sufficiently clear—can do so in his own strength. So, to be sure, there is a secret behind theology, only it is not a trifling trade secret but simply the secret of human life, of our life over which none of us has any power. But let it be clearly understood, this secret is an open secret, and no decree which has been concluded and promulgated somewhere in the heights darkly above our heads. In the midst of this secret new decisions are made to-day and will be made to-morrow. The first can become last and the last first. The wise can reveal themselves as ignorant, and the ignorant can become wise. The history of theology is a witness to this. Whether we count ourselves among the few who understand, or among the many who do not understand, we will not go wrong if we consider theological thinking as an offer, in regard to which the decision which will be made to-morrow remains open to-day. If no one in the light of his own strength is capable of thinking theologically, none the less it may be said in the light of the object of theological thought that verily no one must remain excluded from it.

The Best Books on Missions.

By Professor Godfrey E. Phillips, M.A., Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham.

The difficulty of selection felt throughout the articles in this series is enhanced in this case by the difficulty in defining the limits of the subject. Books not specifically intended for missionaries may nevertheless provide them with their best tools. For example, in the vital matter of 'The Message' some think no better help has been given in recent years than by the opening chapters of E. Brunner's *The Mediator* (Eng. tr., 1934), especially the first on 'The Distinction between General and Special Revelation.' In the same connexion C. H. Dodd's *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments* (1936) shows from the New Testament how there can be bold restatement of the original gospel which does not depart from its original meaning, while Principal Micklem's *What is the Faith?* (1936) should wake up by its sharp challenge any whose preaching has been drifting into the vagueness caused by insufficient attention to the history of revelation. It was never more necessary than in these days that the missionary trumpet should have no uncertain sound.

In the same way books which tell the story of the expanding Christian Church throughout the centuries serve the modern missionary. T. R. Glover's *Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire* (1909) is full of indirect guidance and inspiration. So is Harnack's *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries* (Eng. tr., 1908). Fortunately there is more writing of Church History than formerly which has in mind the Church in the areas where modern missions work. For instance, H. Pakenham-Walsh's *Lights and Shades of Christendom to A.D. 1000* (1936) is written by a missionary churchman with lifelong experience of India. On the relation between Christianity and other religions we get guidance from the writers on Comparative Religion and the Philosophy of Religion. Here we owe a special debt to the late Archbishop Nathan Söderblom of Sweden, two of whose books have been translated into English, a short but weighty one on *The Nature of Revelation* (1933) and the fuller book, *The Living God* (1933), which sets our religion of an historical revelation in its true context of the religious life of the whole world. Dr. Cave on a smaller scale did the same thing in *Christianity and Some Living Religions of the East* (1929).

The Anthropologists open doors for missionaries into the minds of primitive people; a notable example is Dr. R. R. Marett's *The Threshold of Religion*[3] (1914) and his *Faith, Hope, and Charity in Primitive Religion* (1932).

When we come to books more directly on missions, at the outset we are confronted with the unhappy division between Roman Catholics and the rest of us which we regret, but which it is impossible to ignore, more impossible abroad even than at home, for there has been a notable recent advance in Roman Catholic missionary effort which has involved invasion of many Protestant spheres. In the science of missions we have much to learn from the Romans, for they have many centuries of experience as against our one and a half. We have no Bibliography to compare with their *Bibliotheca Missionum* begun by P. R. Streit in 1916 and continued till now by P. J. Dindinger. Here already are eight massive volumes each about a thousand pages, setting out with brief descriptions the literature available on Catholic Missions. The last volume, on literature of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries connected with India and Indonesia, with its 1028 pages is an impressive illustration of the difficulty of selection from material so vast. The text is in German, but naturally the books dealt with are in many tongues. In this article we refer only to two general works on Catholic missions, a useful *Atlas of Catholic Missions* published in German in 1932 with 49 maps—students of missions should never work without maps—and a general work on *Catholic Mission Theory*, by J. Schmidlin (Eng. tr., 1931). It is in the study of the theory of missions that Catholics and non-Catholics have most in common, and on the whole Schmidlin's references to Protestant work are fair-minded. Many Protestants would find a useful intellectual discipline in the reading of such a book as this.

We Protestants, when we need a clear and comprehensive setting out of the theory, doctrine, and fundamental principles of missions, have still nothing in English at all comparable to the monumental three-volume work of Gustav Warneck, *Evangelische Missionslehre*[3] (1902), which first placed the study of missions firmly among the theological disciplines, and so based practice upon sound theory as to justify the use of the term 'Science of Missions.' The world has changed since this book was written, but its principles are still so relevant that any missionary turning over its pages will find guidance for to-day.

Alike in statement of theory and in broad presentation of history, our German colleagues have, as was to be expected, done more than British or Americans. English writers have on the whole done better work in description, presentation of particular situations, study of technique and guidance as to the next practical steps to be taken. The great historian of the missionary enterprise is Julius Richter, whose *History of Missions in India* (1908) and *History of Protestant Missions in the Near East* (1910) are fortunately available in English. His *History of Evangelical Missions in Africa* (1922) is only in German. By the way, Julius Richter on his seventieth birthday in 1932 was presented with a volume of essays written by fifteen of the best known leaders of German missions under the title *Botschafter an Christi Statt* (' Ambassadors on Behalf of Christ '), which makes a convenient introduction to German missionary thought of the present. For historical study British and American missionaries have usually to refer to the standard histories of their own societies. Some of these are both indispensable and excellent, but they are inevitably sectional ; there is scope for more books of Richter's type, surveying large fields as a unity, to be written by Britons or Americans on the history of missions. Missionaries to China are fortunate in having K. S. Latourette's fine *History of Christian Missions in China* (1929).

A whole range of attractive missionary literature designed to educate people of various age-grades in the facts about modern missions has been prepared during our time by the United Council for Missionary Education, representing one of the best bits of inter-church co-operation in our day. Only a few of its outstanding books can be mentioned in this article, but any one can make the acquaintance of the rest through the Bookrooms of the missionary societies. In scientific and practical propaganda of the right kind, work has been done of which British missions are justly proud.

Practical works of reference have been made available through the International Missionary Council, notably the *Directory of Foreign Missions* (1933) which gives particulars, with statistics, of Missionary Societies, Colleges, Co-operative Councils, and other Agencies of the Protestant Churches throughout the world, and the *World Missionary Atlas* (1925), containing maps which show all mission stations.

The Edinburgh Conference of 1910 seems far behind us now, but comprehensive reviewing of the missionary movement began there, so much of its report still has value to a reader who can discriminate, as is not difficult, between the temporary and the permanent. That is yet more true of the eight-volume report of the Jerusalem Meeting of the International Missionary Council (1928), and next year there is to be another world conference. A good way of getting to grips with any major subject connected with modern missions would be to see what was said about it at Edinburgh and Jerusalem, to follow the directions there given to other sources of information, and to read the relevant articles in the quarterly *International Review of Missions* which keeps discussion up to date. Alongside of the more representative statements it is useful to study the American laymen's review of a century of missionary progress in *Rethinking Missions* (1932), which, although most of us consider it over-influenced by left-wing theology, is well worth reading. For the research student there is a mine of information in the seven volumes of facts, published in 1933, upon which the laymen's opinions had been formed.

Two other general storehouses of information must be mentioned. The whole series of ' World Call ' books issued by the Missionary Council of the Anglican Churches, while rightly having Anglican missions mainly in view, has set a good example in its references to other missions and its presentation of the situation in its areas as a whole—see, for instance, *The Call from the Moslem World* (1926). And the World Dominion Press has produced surveys of different parts of the world, crammed with facts gathered with industry and skill, showing the magnitude of the land still to be occupied. There is a poignant interest in its volume by C. A. Garcia and K. G. Grubb, with wonderful maps, diagrams, and illustrations, issued only in 1933, on *Religion in the Republic of Spain*.

Those who simply want a broad outline survey of the missionary enterprise in the changes through which it is passing in our own time can find it in *Missions To-morrow* (1936) by K. S. Latourette of Yale University. They will find a special interest in the masterly closing chapter on the programme of missions in the new day.

What may be called the case for missions has always to be restated, but I doubt whether it can be done much better for our generation than in *A Faith for the World* (1929) by W. Paton, who has now brought it up to date by his *Christianity in the Eastern Conflicts* (1936), written after a journey through Japan, Manchuria and China, India and the Near East. On the terrifying subject of race we have J. H. Oldham's classical *Christianity and* *the Race Problem* (1924), as well as the more popular best-seller B. Mathews' *Clash of Colour* (1924).

On the Biblical foundation of missions, the argument of R. F. Horton's *The Bible a Missionary Book* (1904) is still valid. A new and fascinating study of the New Testament in relation to missionary motive is E. Shillito's *The Way of the Witnesses* (1936). A book which deserves to be more widely known is H. A. Lapham's *The Bible as a Missionary Handbook* (1925), written by a Ceylon missionary who found in the Bible not only the motive for missions but much guidance on missionary method.

Missionary candidates or missionaries who may read this article will be impatient for books relating to their particular field, but it is here that the limitations of space press most severely. We can only mention a few of the greatest books on China, India, and Africa.

CHINA.—The best introduction to the whole subject is K. S. Latourette's *The Chinese, Their History and Culture* (1934). On the religions there is the reliable *Three Religions of China*, by W. E. Soothill (1924), and *Chinese Religious Ideas*, by P. J. Maclagan (1926); and on the history, besides the work mentioned earlier, there is A. C. Moule's attractive *Christians in China before the Year 1550* (1930). A small book packed with accurate 'background' information is W. G. Sewell's *Land and Life of China*.

Chinese Realities, by J. Foster (1928), written out of the heart of a revolutionary situation, threw light on the larger issues affecting modern China in its contacts with the West and with Christianity, and there is the same illuminating quality in his later study of *The Chinese Church in Action* (1933). Three general reports deal with matters of special weight. In 1922 an Educational Commission made a study of the Christian schools and colleges and issued a report *Christian Education in China*, with recommendations for correlating the institutions for advanced education. Like other Eastern countries, China is a land mainly of villages, and it is in them that Christianity has probably its greatest part to play. This lends special importance to the report by an expert in agricultural education, K. L. Butterfield, on *The Rural Mission of the Church in Eastern Asia* (1931). In recent years there has been a deepening of interest in the subject of Religious Education, not merely the maintenance of a few religious institutions, but the nurture in the faith of the whole Christian community, the old and the young, especially the young. In China a deputation of five persons, Chinese and Foreign, after visiting many centres, produced *Religious Education in the Chinese Church* (1931), which has received attention all over China and in some other countries too. It is commonly known as the Weigle Report, after Dr. L. A. Weigle of Yale Divinity School, who had a large share in producing it.

INDIA.—There is a wealth of books on the history, religions, and literature of the people of India, of which the most important for our subject are those by missionary scholars, notably J. N. Farquhar, whose *Outline of the Religious Literature of India* (1920) is a monument of laborious research and an unfailing source of knowledge. It is well supplemented by the whole series of books under his general editorship with the title *Heritage of India*. The late Professor Rudolf Otto wrote interesting studies of Vaishnavite religion under the titles *Mysticism East and West* (1929) and *India's Religion of Grace* (1930). Those who have time to read only one book would be best advised to read N. Macnicol's *The Living Religions of the Indian People* (1934), written out of the combination of scholarship and a lifetime's experience. The same author gave us in 1930, under the title *India in the Dark Wood*, a clear impression of the spiritual situation among non-Christians and Christians, which has not changed in essentials in the seven years since. A general presentation of what Church and Mission have to do is *The Christian Task in India* (1929) by several leading authorities, edited by J. Mackenzie, the Principal of Wilson College, Bombay. The relation between Government and Christian Missions has special importance in India, and can be best understood from a book by A. Mayhew, who held responsible posts in Government education, *Christianity and the Government of India* (1929). The same author's account of British educational policy in India from 1830–1920, *The Education of India* (1926), makes the best introduction to a study of Education in which Missions have played a prominent part. This should be followed by the reading of *Village Education in India* (1920), the Report of a Commission of Inquiry, which laid down the principles on which most subsequent mission efforts to improve rural schools have been based, and *Christian Higher Education in India* (1931), the Report of a similar Commission presided over by the present Master of Balliol, which has led to much overhauling of the Christian Colleges. To complete the study of education there is now available a survey of the Christian High Schools (1936) by Miss van Doren.

The same student of the rural situation who wrote on the Far East, K. L. Butterfield, after a journey through India produced many valuable suggestions in his *Christian Missions in Rural India* (1930).

How an Indian village lives can be vividly realized from either *Seen and Heard in a Panjab Village*, by M. Young (1931), or *Behind Mud Walls*, by C. V. and W. H. Wiser (1932). The movement towards organic union of the Churches in South India has aroused world-wide interest. A clear and reliable account of it is *Christian Union in South India* (1936), by W. J. Noble.

The whole missionary enterprise is likely to be influenced by the facts about conversion of village groups reported in J. W. Pickett's *Christian Mass Movements in India* (1933), one of the most important books in recent years. A supplementary volume by the same author on the conversion of groups of caste people is probably by this time in the press.

On the presentation of the gospel to Hindus, the most considerable piece of work lately has been E. W. Thompson's *The Word of the Cross to Hindus* (1933), which is scholarly, devout, and practical. More work of this kind is needed to give solid content to the evangelism which happily is now so prominent in Indian missions.

AFRICA.—'Africa is as full of problems as an egg is full of meat.' And during the last fifteen years there has fortunately been a revived interest in these problems and closer co-operation between Governments and Missions in tackling them, resulting in a crop of books dealing with the particular provinces which cannot be mentioned here. Nowhere in the world is the race question so acute, and this lends special importance to a little book *Thinking with Africa* (1928), which includes several Africans among the writers of its chapters, and to the able and authoritative *White and Black in Africa* (1930) in which J. H. Oldham made a critical examination of the Rhodes Lectures by General Smuts.

Of the many general books which set out to reveal the mind of Africa, W. C. Willoughby's *The Soul of the Bantu* (1928), with its sequel *Nature Worship and Taboo* (1932), are specially useful to the missionary; so are the shorter books, *The Golden Stool*, by Edwin Smith (1926) and *The African To-day* (1934), by D. Westermann. Dr. Westermann, who is Director of the International Institute of African Languages and Culture, has just written another book, *Africa and Christianity* (1937), which according to reviewers is going to be important. Any one desiring to understand the big issues in Africa would do well to secure the special double number of the *International Review of Missions* for July 1926, which was entirely devoted to authoritative articles on Africa. They were written in preparation for an international conference in Belgium that year between leaders of missions, administrators, and educationists. Edwin Smith wrote up the main results of the conference in *The Christian Mission in Africa* (1926), in which Christian Missions are related to all the new forces which are shaping African life. That was followed next year by an outline of the missionary programme by Donald Fraser in *The New Africa* (1927). A comprehensive and penetrating study of education, indispensable to missionaries, is *The Remaking of Man in Africa* (1931) by J. H. Oldham and B. D. Gibson.

African missions have never lacked great personalities whose recorded doings give colour and concreteness to general studies. For the present day there is Albert Schweitzer with his two books of personal experiences at Lambarene, *On the Edge of the Primeval Forest* (1926) and *More from the Primeval Forest* (1932). One of the newest books has an interest for evangelists everywhere as well as in Africa, because it exemplifies a sound method of presenting Christian truth. Again it is by Edwin Smith, *African Beliefs and Christian Faith* (1936), and its three parts deal with Belief in God among the Africans, Belief in God among the Jews, and The Revelation of God in Jesus Christ. To facilitate easy translation it is written in Basic English, which enhances its lucidity.

This article must end somewhere, so we omit great fields such as The Near East, The Netherlands, Indies, Madagascar, Japan, The South Seas. We also omit two ranges of books each of which could fill another article, one Missions to Moslems, and the other Missionary Biography. Fortunately in the latter case some of the classics are well known, but new ones are appearing of which some deserve to become classics, such as Constance E. Padwick's *Henry Martyn: Confessor of the Faith* (1925), and *Temple Gairdner of Cairo* (1929), or the very different autobiography, Albert Schweitzer's *My Life and Thought* (1933).

Literature.

EZEKIEL.

It is now well over a quarter of a century since Messrs. T. & T. Clark announced that Dr. G. A. Cooke had consented to write the commentary on Ezekiel in the famous *I.C.C.* series. Since then Canon Cooke has done a life's work as Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, and the combination of academic and ecclesiastical duties has prevented him from giving to this book the final form that he would wish it to have. Now, in the early years of his retirement, we have at last before us the fruits of the labours of a lifetime—*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel* (T. & T. Clark; 20s. net). From time to time we have had hints of the writer's views on some of the problems presented by the book, and we warmly welcome the completed volume. We cannot regret the long period that has been spent over this great task. Ezekiel has received more attention than almost any other part of the Old Testament in recent years, and we have seen a number of theories rise and fall even in the post-war period. It may safely be said that the world of scholarship would have been seriously impoverished if Dr. Cooke had issued his commentary ten years ago. As it is, he has been able to study and appraise a great many important suggestions which have been made by various scholars. He has brought to them a sober judgment, conservative but not too much so, and has submitted them to thorough and discriminating scrutiny. Even where not convinced, he has been ready generously to admit the merits of any theory propounded. The only recent volume on Ezekiel which has not been taken into account is Bertholet's commentary in the *Handbuch zum Alten Testament*, and that appeared almost simultaneously with the English scholar's work.

It is, naturally, impossible to enter into detail in speaking of Dr. Cooke's work. Suffice it to say that he is quite in line with the modern view of the structure and history of the prophetic books in general, that he makes a clear distinction between the poetical and the prose portions of the book, rightly attributing the origin of the latter to the deliberate writing down of the prophet's words and experiences. He recognizes the ecstatic nature of Ezekiel's inspiration, and refuses to accept any conclusion based on a denial of the supernatural. While admitting that there are later accretions in the book as it now stands (particularly in chs. 43–48), he rejects the theory that Ezekiel was never in Babylonia at all (held, for example, by James Smith and Herntrich), questions the soundness of Kraetschmar's view of the double text, and eschews both Hölscher's drastic criticism and Torrey's fantastic reconstruction of the history of the book. The exegesis is as sound as the criticism, and the many unpleasant things which Ezekiel has to say are handled with both frankness and tact. In spite of the enormous mass of detail which such a commentary necessarily involves, we get a clear and living impression of the prophet and of his message. The textual and philological notes are full and lucid, always marked by a meticulous accuracy. Some readers will feel it a drawback in the arrangement of the book that these two classes of notes are not separated from one another. This may be due to the need for economizing space, and the same reason may account for the absence of a bibliography. It should be added that the book contains some admirable plans of the Temple as envisaged by Ezekiel, though Dr. Cooke wisely avoids trying to reproduce the cherubim-chariot. The volume as a whole is a notable contribution to Old Testament studies, adding distinction to British scholarship, and a worthy summary of the life-work of a really great scholar.

THE SPIRIT OF METHODISM.

In the Fernley-Hartley Lecture for 1937, under the title of *The Spirit of Methodism* (Epworth Press; 6s. net), the Rev. Henry Bett, M.A., Litt.D., of Handsworth College, Birmingham, has made a detailed study of the religious experience of John Wesley, and of the special contributions which Methodism has made to religion, theology, literature, and social progress. He has also sought to trace the relation of Methodism to the past, and to estimate its prospects as a religious community in the future. The best chapters are undoubtedly those which discuss the contributions of Methodism to the life and thought of the last two hundred years. Packed with valuable information, and written in an attractive and forceful style, these four chapters grip the attention of the reader, and make it difficult to put the book aside. In estimating the theological contribution of Methodism, Dr. Bett shows that Wesley and the early Methodists grounded religion and theology in the fact of experience. He finds the second contribution of Methodism in the fact that 'it made an end of Calvinism, for all practical purposes,' and the third in the new emphasis it laid upon the doctrine of sanctification and in the new exposition which it gave.

Dr. Bett sees the literary contribution in the matchless hymns of Charles Wesley, and in the prose writings of John Wesley and of the early Methodist preachers. Particularly fresh and arresting are his conjectures of how the founder of Methodism would have written in his 'Thoughts upon Slavery' if he had copied the style of Addison or of Samuel Johnson. 'No unprejudiced jury of literary men,' he claims, 'would deny that Wesley's *Journal* is one of the most important and one of the most interesting books of the century, and that his prose style is as powerful and precise an instrument as Swift's; that Charles Wesley is the greatest of all English writers of devotional verse, and that his hymns are really a landmark in the renaissance of English poetry.'

The treatment in much the greater part of Dr. Bett's fine book is admirable, both in presentation and in matter, but his study of the relation of John Wesley to the past is open to the objection that he so overstresses the Moravian and Pietist influences that less than justice is done to his heritage from the English Church. Dr. Bett is also so much on his guard against recent attempts to emphasize the more Catholic elements in the teaching of the Wesleys that he fails to consider the significance of the hundred and sixty-six 'Hymns on the Lord's Supper,' with the Preface from Dr. Brevint's 'The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice,' which reached its *tenth* edition in 1794. His contention is that Wesley's attitude was mainly pragmatic. 'He found that, as a matter of fact, these hallowed rites brought blessing to the believing soul, and therefore he urged them upon his people. That is the truth, and practically the whole truth, of the matter.' Surely, this is a patent under-statement!

In estimating the future development of Methodism, Dr. Bett shows himself doubtful, on the whole, about Reunion. 'There is no great future for Methodism,' he says, 'if it becomes characterless and colourless, and practically indistinguishable from the other evangelical communities. But there is a great future for it if it will be faithful to its own peculiar genius.'

JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

During the winter session of 1935-36 a course of lectures was delivered at King's College, London, on the Age of Transition from Judaism to Christianity, by Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley, Professor E. O. James, Mr. Herbert Loewe, and Professor S. H. Hooke. They have now been published by the Sheldon Press (the Preface is written by Dr. W. K. Lowther Clarke) as the first volume of a series called 'Judaism and Christianity'—*The Age of Transition* (10s. 6d. net). It is right that this should be done, for the lectures deserve the widest possible audience, and form a very important contribution to the study of both the religions concerned. The names of the writers in themselves would have been an adequate guarantee of the excellence of the work. Dr. Oesterley contributes four lectures on the general historical background, the Wisdom and Apocalytic writings, and on the belief in angels and demons. He has long been known as the leading authority in this country—possibly in Europe—on three of these subjects, and shows himself to be equally at home in the general background. His work is a marvel of compression, simple and clear, of the vast mass of knowledge at his disposal, and, while he has added little that is new to what he has written already on these matters, it is a real advantage to have a restatement. Professor James's chapter on religion in the Græco-Roman world should be compared with such a book as Dr. T. R. Glover's 'Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire'; in this essay the reader will find especially valuable the account of Orphism and other types of 'Mystery religion.' The other two authors are, perhaps, not so well known to the Christian public, in spite of their high standing among specialists, and their work here is of remarkable interest. Mr. Loewe represents the same enlightened type of Jewish scholar as did his predecessor in Cambridge, Dr. Israel Abrahams. His study of Pharisaism raises a number of curious questions. The outstanding problem is the relation of Jesus to the Pharisees as depicted in the Gospels. As Abrahams and Montefiore have helped us to realize, the genuine Pharisaic teaching, as it has come down to us in the Talmud, was in harmony with that of Jesus on almost every point, even in matters where the Gospel record represents them as being most at variance. Mr. Loewe utters a solemn warning against rash generalizations; the Pharisees who took counsel with the Herodians against Jesus were far from being typical of their sect. Indeed, Mr. Loewe goes so far as to hint at the possibility that it was not really Pharisees at all, but Sadducees with whom Jesus came into conflict. But Mr. Loewe's attitude towards Jesus is even more striking than his defence of the true Pharisaism, and it may be said that he goes as far in his appreciation of Jesus as it is possible to go without actually becoming a Christian. Pages 160 ff. should be read and studied by every one who wishes to get a clear light on Jesus as He was. Professor Hooke's three chapters are equally illuminating. In those on the way of the initiate and Christianity, and the Mystery religions, he discusses a problem with whose outlines most readers will be familiar, though there is much here that will be new to them. The conclusion reached is that, mainly owing to their Jewish ancestry, we cannot ascribe to the Mystery religions any serious influence on Christianity, though their vocabulary was used by New Testament writers with some freedom. It is in the last chapter of all that Professor Hooke reaches his greatest height, as he discusses the emergence of Christianity from Judaism. Here we have a brilliant summary of the spiritual history of Israel, leading up to a devout and sympathetic interpretation of Jesus, with special stress on the part which the Cross played in His thought. The chapter forms a fitting climax to an extraordinarily interesting and important book.

AN IMPORTANT BOOK FOR RELIGIOUS TEACHERS.

We have used the word 'important,' but we might have used an even stronger word for a new book on the reading and teaching of the New Testament—*The New Testament: A Guide to Bible Reading for Schools and Colleges for the Use of Teachers and Pupils*, by Mr. A. C. Toyne, M.A. (Lutterworth Press; 8s. 6d. net). The book is an ambitious one, but with a noble ambition, to make the New Testament intelligible and credible to young people, and especially to commend the gospel in its fulness to them. It is 'a text-book on the Christian Religion founded on New Testament Study.' The author pays a compliment to youth when he says that his work is chiefly designed for boys and girls of fourteen to eighteen years of age, for this large volume discusses the deepest questions of religious thought in a thorough manner. He assumes a certain knowledge of facts, and discusses the religious significance of these rather than the facts and events themselves. He also generously assumes that boys and girls who can learn the meaning of expressions like gerundive, isobar, congruency of triangles can also learn the meaning of words like immanence, eschatology, sanctification, and logos.

The first part of the book deals with the religious content and literary problems of the Synoptic Gospels, Acts, Romans, and St. John. It contains two sections on the religious and ethical teaching of Jesus, in which with admirable frankness and freedom from tradition the author states and discusses some of the acute problems raised by Jesus' words. A section on the literary characteristics of the Synoptic Gospels gives a sufficiently full account of their historical trustworthiness. The same treatment is given to Acts. A long chapter of fifty pages furnishes a summary of the contents of Romans, and one nearly as long deals with St. John. The second part of the book contains summaries of the other New Testament books, with general remarks on their value and teaching.

This bald summary of a remarkable book gives little indication of the rich material it offers to the teacher. The sincerity and freshness with which the acute points of our Lord's teaching are handled, the clearness with which the critical issues in the Fourth Gospel are stated, and the admirable description of the gradual way in which belief in the Incarnation came to the New Testament writers, may serve as examples. One feels that Mr. Toyne has gone to the New Testament and looked at it with his own eyes. It would be a heartening thing to think that such a book as this will actually be used in schools. At any rate no book of recent times is more calculated to promote real religious education as distinct from the teaching of 'facts.' We most warmly wish it a wide influence in the educational world.

THE TOTALITARIAN STATE.

Religion and the Totalitarian State, by Sir Charles Grant Robertson, C.V.O., M.A., LL.D. (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net), is a reprint and enlargement of the Beckly Social Service Lecture for 1937, in which the author has analysed the principles of the Totalitarian State and of religion respectively, and has attempted to show the possible relation between them. His main thesis is that it is impossible for any religion worthy of the name to submit to the claims of the Totalitarian State to be a transcendent entity of absolute value with a right to the unqualified allegiance of its subjects, without being false to the essential obligations of religion. Christianity implies a belief in the Divine government of the universe, and regards the State as part, but part only, of the order consequent on that government. For the Christian the individual human personality has supreme value, and cannot be sacrificed at the behest of the State. He believes further in a Kingdom of God, with which even the most perfectly organized human society cannot be forthwith identified. The autonomy of the Church is inherent in its very nature, and can only be recognized, and not conferred, by the State. The Church does not, indeed, claim to be an *imperium in imperio*; its authority belongs to a different sphere, that of the individual conscience and the relation of the human soul to God, in respect of which it can brook no interference from the State.

The consequence of these contrasts, according to the author, is a challenge to the Christian Church which it 'cannot evade without committing suicide.' It must resolutely oppose any attempt of the State to dominate education, as well as all the other agencies of propaganda, so greatly increased by modern invention, which have as their aim the complete control of the thought-life of the citizens. The Church must show also that sheer nationalism and racialism are a travesty of Christianity. In order to fulfil its function the Church must, above all, close its ranks: 'divide and defeat,' says the author, 'is a fatal gift to present to your opponents.' Finally, the Church must not be faint-hearted, and sell her birthright for an accommodating peace by saying that Christianity has to do only with the concerns of the individual, and need not involve itself in matters affecting the community. The Church exists as a society or not at all, and as a society it must save civilization even at the edge of the abyss. If the lecture had been published within the last few days, Sir Charles Robertson might have quoted appositely from the Manifesto of the Evangelical Churches in Germany, read from their pulpits on Sunday, September 5, in which they demand 'full freedom to preach the undiluted Gospel,' and state that at the present time 'a Church conscious of doing its duty is treated in large parts of the Fatherland as an enemy to be fought and destroyed.'

A really delightful book of essays comes from a preacher and writer who, though an American, is very well known and much appreciated on this side of the water—*The Civilized Mind:* Forest Essays, second series, by Lynn Harold Hough, Dean of Drew Theological Seminary (Abingdon Press; $2.00). Dr. Hough may be described as a religious humanist. He is a man of letters who is at home in theology, and in these essays he contends that real humanism must find its completion in the gospel. He sets this forth in a brilliant example in his essay on Paul Elmer More, who is apparently one of his heroes. Another is Professor Babbitt, and these two names crop up in many of the essays. They are not as well known here as perhaps they ought to be, but Dr. Hough's references to them and their writings awaken our curiosity and may lead many to make their acquaintance.

The essays in this volume are of a miscellaneous character—'Books on my Study Table.' 'The Intellectual Life of the Preacher,' 'The Queen of the Sciences in our Time,' 'Liberty and Law'—but they all bear on the main theme, the crying need of our time for the Christian message. Dr. Hough is severe on the average American preacher and on the moral and spiritual condition of the age. The 'civilized mind,' the mind of Plato, Virgil, Shakespeare, Goethe, Sainte-Beuve, Matthew Arnold, is almost extinct, and can only be resuscitated by the quickening power of faith. How sympathetic and understanding Dr. Hough can be, on the other hand, is revealed in a perfectly charming essay on 'Britain through American Eyes,' the insight of which is matched only by its generosity.

What is the relationship between culture and religion? How are secular activities related to religious activities? The Church has always found in the trivial round, the common task, the sphere of discipline and service. But what of the other activities we *choose*—art, literature, science, the novels we read, the plays we see, the games we play? What is the relation of all this to religion? How far is culture involved in the religious life? These are the questions dealt with in the latest Swarthmore Lecture on *Religion and Culture*, by Miss Caroline C. Graveson, B.A. (Allen & Unwin; 2s. 6d.; paper, 1s. 6d. net). Emphasis is often laid on the simplicity of the Christian life, on the irrelevance of learning to the Kingdom of God. And we need to be clear about the place humanism and culture play in our religious life. They have been divorced far too long. And, as Miss Graveson contends, one of our urgent needs is to 'enlarge the country of God' so as to compass in it more of the interests of life. This is fully in accord with the Quaker doctrine of the sacramental life, and the book before us may be regarded as an intelligent exposition of modern Quaker principles.

Professor A. Campbell Garnett, M.A., Litt.D., of the University of Wisconsin has written *Reality and*

Value, which he describes as 'an Introduction to Metaphysics and an Essay on the Theory of Value' (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net). As an introduction to philosophical studies it will serve students admirably. We do not mean that it is a book only for beginners. But it gives such a lucid and readable account of various theories which it is of consequence to know, that the student will find himself soundly instructed and wisely guided into the heart of philosophical discussion. The writer's main interest is in the theory of values; but because he believes that we are aware of the reality of values in precisely the same way as we are aware of the reality of other things, and that our knowledge of mind is as direct and reliable as our knowledge of the material world, he begins with Epistemology, analysing the process of knowledge in general. His most important contention is that our knowledge of God and of the good rests upon a direct acquaintance as unequivocal as in the case of our knowledge of the self and the world.

The style is simple and the argument is developed by easy stages, and altogether we can most cordially recommend the work.

Fourteen years ago there appeared in German a small book which has exercised a profound influence. It was written by Martin Buber. Mr. Ronald Gregor Smith has translated it into English—*I and Thou* (T. & T. Clark; 2s. 6d. net). We congratulate Mr. Smith on the felicity of his translation. We are grateful, too, for the excellent introductory chapter in which he sets forth both the essentials of Buber's teaching, and the wide range of influence which Buber's little but pregnant work has exerted. If we may make one suggestion, it would be that in the next edition, which we hope will be called for soon, a short account might be given of Buber himself; for we are fairly certain that to many in this country next to nothing is known of him. Buber, as the book reveals, is a mystic, a poet, a profound philosopher, and a deeply religious man. Never, except in Pascal's 'Pensées,' has philosophical thought been expressed in this way. The book is written in short paragraphs, not disconnected but separable. The style is poetical, and the whole is mysticism in the best sense. Buber's main position is that there is a vital difference between a man's attitude to persons and to things. But inevitably to man another person becomes an object—'thou' becomes an 'it.' God, however, is a 'Thou' which never becomes an 'it'; God may be only 'addressed' never 'expressed.' The influence of this distinction is very clearly traceable in Karl Heim.

I and Thou is one of the books that will live and prove life- and light-giving.

Books of prayers for young people often disappoint, sometimes because of the unsuitable language employed, and sometimes because the thought is not what would naturally enter a child's mind. It seems as difficult to write a prayer for children as to make an appropriate address for them. However, *Prayers for School Use,* by Mr. C. M. Fox (Lutterworth Press; 2s. 6d. net), is somewhat exceptional, both in sentiment and language. The prayers are brief (an indispensable quality), and simple and comprehensive. The rubrics are for special occasions, all sorts and conditions of men, mental and bodily vigour, faithful service, our relations with God and victory over sin, and a right relation with others. There are suitable readings after each prayer.

King of Kings, a Devotional Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel, by the Rev. Hugh C. C. M'Cullough (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 2s. 6d. net), is constructed on the basis of the Coronation of King George. The ceremonial of the Coronation is used to illustrate our devotion to the King of kings. Chapters are devoted to the Royal Proclamation, the Divine Sovereignty, the Crown Jewels, the King's Keys, and so on. The symbolism is obvious, and the exposition is full of devout and edifying insight.

Clever but not always convincing is the verdict we feel constrained to pass on Mr. F. Hugh Capron's answer to Spiritualism set forth in *The Highway to Heaven and a Byway to Nowhere* (Methuen; 5s. net). The highway is the orthodox Christian faith as founded on Scripture; the byway is Spiritualism. Mr. Capron is persuaded in his own mind that Spiritualism is a dangerous rival to true Christianity, and devotes his keen critical faculties to showing its unsatisfactory nature. He limits his view, however, mainly to one widely circulating spiritualistic book which attempts to conserve all the Bible narratives by giving a spiritualistic interpretation. Thus when the Bible says 'God spake to' a prophet, the interpretation is that the prophet's spirit-guide revealed. Mr. Capron has no difficulty in showing to what absurdity as well as violence to the Scripture such a treatment leads. He thinks and says that Spiritualists can logically believe in no Spirit save discarnate human spirits, and in consequence God has disappeared. The trouble is that no Spiritualist we have met would ever agree that such was actually his view of Spirit. Yet the book is far from being without value, and we commend a perusal of it to any tempted to desert the 'highway for the byway.'

Guidance about public prayer and the celebrating of Holy Communion is given to ministers of the Anglican Church in *Liturgy in the Parish*, by members of the Alcuin Club (Mowbray; 2s. net). This is the first volume of 'Alcuin Leaflets,' each of which (here bound together) can be obtained separately. The chapter headings will indicate the contents of the volume—Praying with the Church, The Consecration of the Eucharist, English Use, The Parish Eucharist, The Catholic Altar and Processions. Much interesting and useful detail is given on the various topics.

In the 'Needs of To-day' series, Father Martindale, S.J., has produced a little book, *Does God Matter for Me?* (Rich & Cowan; 3s. 6d. net). It is not exactly an apologia for faith. That is provided in Dr. Alington's 'Can We Believe in God?' It deals mainly with the consequences which such a belief has in human life. But as a matter of fact Father Martindale cannot keep his hand off the main problem of belief. And one of his chief points is that man can find certainty of God's existence by the exercise of his reason. He rightly protests against the modern belittling of reason, and the tendency to base faith on intuition or some other non-rational function, and on this point he is very definite and convincing. But the substance of his book has to do with the effects on ourselves of belief, and there are chapters on God Paramount, God our Rescuer, God our Enrichment, God controlling Me, and God and Human Society.

One of the charms of this book is its discursiveness. The writer roams over all fields, dealing with Freud, Marx, and other sponsors of heresies, and he makes it all relevant to his main theme. He was asked by the publishers to make his book practical, popular, and personal. And it is all three. Indeed, it is written in an easy, conversational style that makes it a pleasure to read. It would be difficult to find a better guide to inquiring minds that are not accustomed to grapple with academic language, but want real thinking expressed in familiar terms. Father Martindale does not write as a Roman Catholic, but there is the usual 'Nihil Obstat' and 'Imprimatur,' and the books suggested for further reading seem to be Romanist publications. But this ought not to deter any reader from the study of this racy and helpful volume.

In *Recent Psychic Experiences* (Seeley, Service; 5s. net), Mr. E. A. Reeves gives an account of 'manifestations' he received at various times. He was till lately map curator and instructor in surveying to the Royal Geographical Society. For many years members of practically all exploring expeditions that have left our shores have received instruction from him, including those of Scott and Shackleton. He thus has had a scientific training, and may be regarded as not too credulous. In his book he tells us of visions and communications that gave him information otherwise unobtainable. He saw his mother and heard from her both directly and indirectly. He was told about the anxiety of a sister to see him by a medium who apparently could read his sister's mind. And in many other ways he was brought into contact with the Unseen. Those who are interested will find the evidence for all this set down with modesty, but also with firm conviction. One thing ought to be stated. Mr. Reeves, unlike many spiritualists, is a Christian in the full sense by belief.

The Patience of God, by the Rev. A. H. Thompson (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net), is a book of devotional meditations of a rare quality. In successive chapters on the Divine patience in the universe, in revelation, in grace, with man, with the soul, and then on human patience with ourselves, with one another and with God, the writer leads the reader to 'green pastures and waters of comfort.' The book will be a good gift to the sick, the sorrowful, and all who find life hard. But indeed, as we all need the patience of God, it is a book for everybody. Mention must be made of the beautiful prayers at the end of the chapters, and also of the fineness of the writing.

Mr. J. F. Mozley, M.A., is convinced that William Tyndale is a man who has never yet received his due, whose 'reputation has been at the mercy of ignorance and partisanship.' So he has set himself to a fresh study of all available sources from which the authentic details of the life and work of 'a great Englishman and a great Christian man' may be gathered, and has given us a truly noble account of him in *William Tyndale* (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net). He tells us that even this work is not the final record, but we are sure that for a considerable time to come it will be the standard work of reference. Tyndale's interesting and finally tragic story is here set forth in felicitous style, and for every fact full evidence is produced. Facts long concealed in State Papers or buried in learned magazines are here resurrected and made known to the reading public; to give only one example, we get notice of a letter in Tyndale's own hand which had reposed unread amid the archives of the Council of Brabant for more than three hundred years. All who are interested in the Reformation, and more especially in our English Bible, will turn with avidity to this learned, fascinating, and reliable account of one whose name deserves to be held in everlasting and grateful remembrance.

During last autumn a group of friends met in Westminster to consider the possibility of taking some steps towards making more effective in relation to problems of the day the great body of Christian feeling which exists in all classes of society. It was decided to promote as far as possible the study of some of the chief contemporary problems with a view to reaching a body of agreement on which action could be taken. A manifesto was issued and received a fair measure of publicity. The Archbishop of York was one of the group, and he has written a brief pamphlet, *Christian Democracy* (S.C.M.; 6d. net), to set out more fully what was in the minds of those who approved the manifesto. The main purpose of the booklet is to show the intrinsic kinship between the ultimate intuitions of the Christian faith and the attitude towards life which is expressed in and encouraged by reliance on reason. One conclusion is that democracy is best fitted to carry into human affairs the Christian conception of man, and also that democracy can only survive if it is Christian. But the principle is illustrated in other ways, in the individual's relation to society, in regard to our attitude to war, and also in our relation with the present social structure. The argument is luminous, and Dr. Temple's essay should receive wide attention.

Everything that Professor Reinhold Niebuhr writes is of great value, and his Burge Memorial Lecture for 1937 is specially timely. It bears the challenging title *Do the State and Nation belong to God or the Devil?* and is published by the S.C.M. at the price of sixpence. It is therefore within the reach of all, and we should like to see it in the hands of a great multitude in all lands. Professor Niebuhr's own answer to his own question comes to this—in both nation and State there is something of God, but far too much of the Devil. The State needs power, any pacifism which is so radical as to renounce all power can lead only to sentimental individualistic anarchy. But the craving for power is man's perennial temptation, and power inevitably tends to displace justice. The popular pacificism which would substitute 'spiritual' power for violence cannot guarantee that in wielding 'spiritual' power a nation or State or class would not likewise do violence to justice. The Papacy is the outstanding historical instance. To solve the problem of power is not easy. The existence of a strong and real democracy keenly critical of those into whose hands power has been entrusted will be useful, but negatively rather than positively. Better will be the recognition and acknowledgment of a Divine Majesty which transcends all temporal sovereignties. Ideally Christianity does this, and teaches this; but the Church has only too often been corrupted into subservience to nationalism. The prophet too easily becomes the priest; not a keen critic of what is, but the defender of the established system.

There has been a pause in the spate of books about modern psychology. But in *Psychology: The Changing Outlook*, by Professor Francis Aveling, M.C., D.Lit., D.Sc., Ph.D. (Watts; 2s. 6d. net), we have one from the competent hand of the Professor of Psychology in the University of London, and we naturally expect something of a special quality and authority from such a source. The book is one of a series, 'The Changing World Library,' that is apparently intended to have a popular appeal. Dr. Aveling has not yielded to this idea so far as to make his book easy reading. The book is a serious effort to present to serious readers the present situation in the psychological world, and that is not easy in the limited space allowed him. One result is that there is a lack of definite illustration to make the argument grip, and also of criticism of the various theories. The book is expository, not critical, but it would have been more useful if Dr. Aveling had revealed his own mind more freely. Psychology is in an extraordinary state of confusion at present. There are nearly as many psychologies, or schools of psychology, as there are instincts, and some of them are flatly contradictory in essential matters to others. The inexperienced reader may be warned that some of the theories expounded here are open to very real question, and he should supplement the exposition by further study. But with these qualifications it may be said that a very fair and (within limits) sufficient account is given here of the different psychological theories, and also of the applications of these to industry, education, medicine, and criminology.

Register that great spiritual decision [illegible]
impressiveness. The conversion at the altar.

Old Texts in Modern Translations.

Numbers x. 29–32 (Moffatt).

1. ~~the [illegible]~~
2.
3.

By the Reverend John A. Irvine, B.A., Biggar.

'Moses said to his father-in-law Hobab, the son of Reûel the Midianite, "We are starting for the country which the Eternal has promised to give us; come along with us and share in our prosperity, for the Eternal has promised to prosper Israel." "I will not go," he answered, "I will depart to my native country and my kinsfolk." But Moses said, "Pray do not leave us, for you know where we can camp in the desert; come and be a pair of eyes for us, and as the Eternal prospers us, so will we prosper you."'

The writer has done well. It would be a dull imagination and a prosaic mind indeed that was not kindled by this great story and that did not feel how much more lay behind than the mere record of a migratory movement of some desert tribes. It is another out-cropping of the age-long conflict between the seen and the unseen, between the tyranny of sense and the challenge of faith.

Here we have the first account of the setting out, and the details of it are worthy of a great occasion. The two silver trumpets, the preparation of the various divisions, the ordered discipline are all part of a great enterprise. So the tale unfolds, and one watches clan after clan depart, moving off along the untrodden way until all are on the march.

st.
tting

Do we not feel the thrill of the great sight, and can we not understand how Moses turns round to Hobab, his face shining, his soul aflame, and says, 'Come along with us and share our prosperity, for the Eternal has promised to prosper Israel.' How could any man stand out against such an appeal, who could resist such an alluring call?

So is it with the appeal the Church of Christ is making to us all at the opening of the new campaign this autumn for the recall of the nation to religion: 'the opportunity to realize afresh the things which matter most to us, to make plain where we are and what we stand for, and, turning our hearts humbly and expectantly toward God, receive more life and power.'

is Well-
done - in
e Church

'Come thou with us, and we will do thee good.' Let us look at the grounds of this assurance. First of all, there is the importance of making a moral decision, new and quick and final. The words rendered in the Authorized Version, 'We are journeying,' are really far more suggestive than that. More accurately what Moses says is 'We are starting.' There is something fresh about this. The long waiting-time is past. Hobab had been with them during the days of the encampment, had moved in and out amongst them until the whisper ran round of a change and of a great eventful moment having arrived. Here was a new commencement, a break with the drab past, 'We are starting,' 'Come along with us.' We are starting

It is a great thing to have to make a moral decision, to face things in a new way, to strike tents, to step out with new resolves. That does every man good, it stirs our sluggish natures, it compels to new ventures of the soul.

Such hours, whenever and however they come, and come they do to all, face us with that heart-searching question, Have you made the best of your life? And if you must say No, if in spite of all the varied interests and all the feverish attempts to reach something that will make life worth while, you have failed, and are still unsatisfied, then 'Come along with us' the Church is saying. 'We are just on the point of starting, do not be left behind.' The very swiftness and urgency of the choice have spiritual value. It may be possible to join the cavalcade *en route*, but it is better far to be there at the start. Be a chartered pilgrim

Note, secondly, the venture of faith. All that Moses could give to Hobab was just the assurance of God's promise, 'We are starting for the country which the Eternal has promised to give us.' This bare naked promise of God might mean much to Moses steeped in a religious past, but to a man like Hobab what could it mean? It was a venture, there was nothing to be seen, the reward had to be waited for, and fought for, the goal was out of sight. It was all very well this marching out so bravely, this blowing of trumpets, but in the end it might come to nothing ? And so Hobab says as men are so ready to do, 'A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush,' 'I will not go. I will depart to my native country and my kinsfolk.' At any rate he knew where he was with them, and the hazards of the desert march, and the perils of the conflict, did not appeal to him.

There are souls all around us feeling like that. They do not dislike goodness, but they are not going to make any great sacrifice for it. The whole thing for them is too vague, too far away, religion bores them, and religious people are not attractive, not their sort any more than the Israelites were Hobab's, and so they say, 'I will not go. I will depart to my native country and my kinsfolk.'

But it is not a question of whether you feel religious associations appeal to you, rather it is whether you will let the great moment slip past of learning that 'Man does not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.' 'Come along with us' and you will find the real worth of consecrated lives some day, and how great and ennobling a power in life true religion is where you find it at its best. And it can be found at its best, the pure home life, the loving relationships, the calm steadfastness of purpose under overwhelming calamities, the forgetfulness of self in devotion to a great cause, the power to ride out the storm, the humble submission to the Divine will, the triumphant assurance that all things work together for good.

All these fine qualities are rooted in a sincere and simple faith, a devout, personal trust in God. For, as Dr. Fosdick puts it, 'Man needs desperately the ministry of religion, its insight into life's meaning, its control over life's use, its inward power for life's moral purpose.'

Thirdly, there is the romance of the venture. The finest touch of all, in this story, is the closing one. Moses could not bear to think of Hobab missing this great opportunity in life. Yet the man's mind seemed made up. There was only one thing to do. Hobab did not grasp the real significance of Israel's journeying and national future, and Moses could not stay to argue with him, so he made the appeal for the man's help, 'Pray do not leave us, for you know where we can camp in the desert; come and be a pair of eyes for us.' That won the day, and Hobab went with them, and ever after Israel remembered the kindness he showed them.

Now every one has a gift if only we had the insight to find it. You can win men sometimes, who would be otherwise unyielding, if you can make them aware that they have a contribution to bring. It may be they have power to organize, capacity to teach, ability to handle others, and once they have been caught in the great movement of the Kingdom of God a new interest may awake, the appeal of its grandeur may touch them, the new fellowship created may bring a wider sympathy, a better understanding of how noble a thing Christian living can be. The indifference, the worldliness, the self-centredness, the easy morals may drop from them, and they put on the Lord Jesus Christ, and are clothed with a new beauty.

That William the Silent became the Christian hero of the sixteenth century he owed to the fact that under God he took up the defence of the oppressed Christians of the Netherlands. Coming to that enterprise merely as a wealthy magnate and far-seeing politician, the sacredness of the cause passed into his soul, and to quote Motley's great tribute, 'without a particle of cant or fanaticism he had become a deeply religious man. Hitherto he had been only a man of the world and a statesman, but from this time forth he began to rely upon God's providence in all the emergencies of his eventful life. . . . His religion was not a cloak to his designs, but a consolation in his disasters.'

Are there not openings in the large enterprises of God's purpose for which, unknown to us, and unsuspected by themselves, the right men are ready? Are there not endowments in the wide field of human character which only need to be released to bring enrichment to the Church, gifts all the more valuable because not of the common order? Are we too cramped, too conventional, to find the use God may have for such souls?

When once He has girded them, though they have not known Him, those Hands that 'out of darkness reach through nature moulding men' can set them to tasks that wake new visions, that call for strength that must be sought beyond themselves, that bring them up to closed doors for which Christ alone holds the key.

Discontinuity in the Physical and the Spiritual.

By the Reverend W. J. Masson, B.D., Edinburgh.

If a certain thing is found in the physical realm, it does not follow that its counterpart must exist in the spiritual. Yet seeing that the same God is over both spheres, we may be allowed to expect a certain correspondence between them, and at least to assume the possibility of His using in the higher the methods of working which we find Him using in the lower. If, in the latter, He acts in two ways, it is *a priori* improbable that He limits Himself to one in the former. Now, that there is continuity, growth, in both the physical and the spiritual, no one will question. But what of discontinuity, catastrophe? Modern theology tends to ignore or belittle it, but can that be wise when it plays such a large and important part in the realm of Nature?

One thinks, first of all, of the Quantum Theory which Whitehead thus describes clearly if somewhat crudely, 'Some effects which appear essentially capable of gradual increase or gradual diminution, are, in reality, to be increased or decreased only by certain definite jumps. It is as though you could walk at three miles per hour or at four miles per hour, but not at three and a half miles per hour.'[1] Matter is discontinuous. The distance between the different molecules or atoms is large compared with their size. 'O that this too too solid flesh would melt, thaw and resolve itself into a dew,' wailed Hamlet, but, as a matter of fact, it would not have helped him much had the solid flesh done so; whereas, if he had been able to squeeze all the emptiness out of himself, he would have been reduced to microscopic dimensions. Matter is discontinuous. But now we find that radiation is so also. Light, for example, we used to think of as like a river flowing on steadily, like waves of the sea advancing regularly one after the other, but now we see that that will not do. We must get back to Newton's idea of corpuscular light, and the only way we can combine it with the wave theory, which, for certain reasons, we must still hold, is to think of the waves as done up in packets or groups, moving with a speed of their own, quite different from that of the waves. Even radiation is not continuous.

Let this suffice for physical science. What of biological science, the home country of the theory of evolution which requires that continuity be fundamental? Here the twentieth century has witnessed a great change. Not that there is perfect unanimity among biologists, but all are agreed upon this, that Darwin's theory must be considerably modified, that there has been no steady progress of the living organism from the unicellular amœba to man, the crown of creation. Even the strictest evolutionists allow it to have been jerky. Some lay stress on 'sports,' claiming that they are 'creative in their function and carry forward the march of life.' Others emphasize inter-breeding and the strange results often produced by it. Still others seek an explanation in the creature's response to its environment. Especially interesting is the theory put forward by one prominent anthropologist. Discussing the origin of man, he emphatically opposes the theory that he is descended from the man-like apes or any of their immediate ancestors. The process of evolution has never been a steady development along one particular line. Rather has it been like the growth of a tree, sending out branches in various directions, but the main stem following a line of its own upward. Some of these branches have withered and fallen off, others still remain with us, but neither are part of the stem. The upward urge of life broke out, for example, into the branch of the reptiles which developed till it produced the huge creatures of the Carboniferous Period. Then it died, leaving only a few twigs of the reptiles we still know alive on the earth. Then from some purely general form of reptile, or perhaps a still more generalized form to which no name could be given, came the first birds, a branch which has sent out its twigs in all directions, but yet only a branch. From some other general form came the next step, and so on it has gone till now, he concludes, evolution has stopped, for there are no more general forms from which the development may come. He may or may not be right in this last assumption, but his theory is an interesting illustration of how, even in the sciences of life, the birthplace of evolutionary thinking, students are being forced to recognize a fundamental discontinuity.

This, of course, is quite unmistakably proved by Mendelism. Through his experiments with tall and dwarf peas, Mendel showed that nothing could alter their nature, that however they were crossed, they still remained true to their original character. There is no way of producing seeds that will give something between these two peas. The one does not, and cannot be made to, slide into the other.

---

[1] *Science and the Modern World*, 161.

The anthropologist referred to above also claims that instead of following a line of steady development like the flowing of a river, evolution has been like a river that is constantly held up by dams. There have been periods in which the progress has been very rapid, just as when a river overflows a dam, and then long stretches in which matters were practically at a standstill, flowing with a scarcely perceptible current, like a river between the dams. As an illustration, we may think of the slow progress made by science since the days of the Babylonians and Egyptians, and the breath-catching rapidity of its development in our own day. Captain Whitfield of the P. & O. Steamship Company, in his autobiography, remarks on his own experience of this. 'For hundreds of years,' he writes, 'the world stood still and there was little difference between the conditions during the days of Columbus and my own early sea days less than fifty years ago. But during this interval the progress has been amazing.' Another example of discontinuity or at least of jerky evolution.

The origin of life is still a mystery, though the chemistry of colloids promises us some interesting information and we must beware of building on our ignorance. Yet what can be more discontinuous than the hatching of a chicken from an egg, at one moment shut up in its prison, at the next an air-breathing bird. And we might carry the matter back to the beginning, to the fertilizing of the egg. What a change the entrance of the male element made! So one might well say that the most fundamental fact in the biological sciences, the beginning of a life, is discontinuous.

It was needful to dwell at some length on the situation in biology seeing it played such an important part in the history of human thought, but a brief glance will suffice for the other sciences. Geology, the science of the rocks, hardly needs to inform us that changes take place in the crust of the earth with startling rapidity. There are too many earthquakes to allow us to make any mistake about that. Sedimentary rocks may form through a long continuous process, but igneous rocks and faults are the outcome of catastrophe. The great beds of fossils, which we find in certain places, point in the same direction. It is hardly likely that we should have found them together in such numbers had death come upon them in the usual way. Rather does it seem as if some great calamity had overwhelmed them and blotted out that particular form of life, at any rate, in that district.

And there is astronomy. Continuity would demand that the Solar System came into being as the result of the steady cooling of matter, but have we not all been thrilled by Jeans's tale of the great star that came too near and tore out a piece which went whirling away on its own and finally formed our system and globe? Younghusband in his book, *The Living Universe*, has a picture worth our consideration in this connexion. Here are his own words. 'Then a crust must have formed, and then a most extraordinary event occurred, one of those novelties or newnesses in Nature which are so utterly unpredictable, two gases combined to form something so totally unlike a gas as water. A "jump" of momentous consequence to this earth had been made.'[1]

In chemistry it will be sufficient to recall the existence of isotopes, substances with the same chemical properties but different atomic weights, and how the discovery of these has gone to show that the atomic weights of all elements are exact multiples of that of hydrogen, or rather of a quarter of that of helium. There is no shading off from one to the other.

In all branches of scientific investigation, then, it is recognized that discontinuity not only exists, but even plays a very important part in the general economy. Now what about the spiritual realm? What bearing have these facts of Nature upon spiritual truth? As facts, probably very little. But the fact that they are facts means a great deal.

How? It was in 1859 that Darwin published his famous book, *The Origin of Species*, and so started a line of thought which has been fruitful of much good and not a little ill, the theory of evolution. It spread like wildfire, invading every class and rank of life. As Moffatt says in his description of *The Day before Yesterday*: 'If one feature rather than another was characteristic of the age, it was the saturation of the general mind by the thought of what is loosely called "evolution." Before very long we discover men and women, not so much arguing for or against the doctrine, as, almost unconsciously, employing it in their views of the world, past and present. It is in the mental atmosphere wherever you turn during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, crudely applied sometimes, and as crudely challenged, but always there.'[2] The chief opponent of this theory was, of course, to be found in Christian theology, for it seemed to be in direct opposition to the dogma of creation by God, and for a long time the battle was furious and bitter. However, as so often happens, quondam enemies become one's most loyal friends, and to-day it is among theologians that the idea of creation by evolution finds its most resolute supporters. Science may regard it as only one among many influences at work. Philosophy may look askance at its protégé as not so wonderful after all, but most of our theology still tries to be true to the fallen monarch, talking as if slow evolution were God's only way of working, in the earth beneath or in heaven above. This is what rouses the ire of the Barthians. 'In fact,' says Brunner in his *The Theology of Crisis*, 'the idea of the Kingdom of God and that of evolution and progress are mutually antagonistic.'[1] This may be going too far, but scientific thought would certainly agree that far too much stress is laid upon growth in theology, and would accept, for its own sphere, his dictum, 'The thought of discontinuity is basic to every primary doctrine of Christianity.'[2]

---

[1] P. 34.

[2] P. 56.

But general charges such as these do not get us anywhere. Let us come down to particulars, and first, the doctrine of the future life. In their Shorter Catechism, the Westminster Assembly Divines stated their belief that 'the souls of believers are, at their death, made perfect in righteousness and do immediately pass into glory.' That statement, of course, was inspired by their hatred of the Romish doctrine of purgatory, and it presented no difficulty to their thinking. Their minds were under the influence of the literal interpretation of Gn 1, where a day consisted of twelve hours and everything appeared out of nothing as soon as God spoke the word. It was a sudden creation of something out of nothing, and they had no difficulty, therefore, in believing in a similar break and new creation when death set the soul free from the body. To modern theological thinking, however, there is great difficulty in such a belief. In fact, it is utterly intolerable, and an intermediate state, sometimes indeed many of them, is claimed to be absolutely necessary, on the ground that we shall need time to become fit for the glory of God's presence. In his *The Valley and Beyond*, Anthony C. Deane writes: 'A reason which probably inclines all of us to believe in some intermediate state between death and heaven, is the profound consciousness of our unfitness, when we die, to pass, without further preparation, into the heavenly state. All of us feel that we have still so much to learn.' Then after referring to those who were killed in the War, and to the heathen, he goes on, 'For ourselves, there may well be a feeling that we shall not at once be fit for heaven when we die.[3] And he writes thus, although only ten pages previously, he had had to acknowledge that, 'In the sum of the forces which have shaped this world, . . . the factor of catastrophe has been operative.'[4] So in his well-known book, 'At death, the souls pass into the next stage of their evolution. They are happy and blessed. . . . But they are, as yet, unready for the full vision of God. All God's processes are slow.' Then later he continues: 'God cannot have one method here and another within the veil. One law reigns everywhere in the physical universe; and also in the spiritual universe. It cannot well be that creatures so imperfect as we are, should at death be made perfect in holiness and immediately pass into glory. . . . Those grey toneless lives are not the fit furnishings of Heaven. They are certainly fit for Paradise, and Paradise is but the courtyard of Heaven.'[5] He too regards catastrophe as an 'also ran,' in the making of the world, and would, therefore, allow it no place at all in the world beyond. But is not that to contradict his own thesis that the same law runs through the physical and spiritual worlds? He certainly does not appreciate how large a part discontinuity has played in the making of this world, but if it has played any part at all here, then, by his own claim, it must play some part there. Evolution does not reign alone here and, therefore, it cannot do so there.

Recognize, however, what has been shown above, that discontinuity plays a very large part here, and then consider death itself. What could be more catastrophic, discontinuous? What greater gulf could there be than that between the living and the dead? It is not a case of evolution when the last sigh is breathed and death claims the body; from that moment the body is quite different. Why deny that the soul can be quite different? To treat the future as merely a continuation of the present is absurd; there may be development there, but if so, we start from an altogether different level. What that will be we cannot tell, but the Catechism may not be far wrong. The mere fact that this would be a break in continuity is neither here nor there. Probably it is a recommendation, for the physical realm declares that God believes in jumps, and there is no bridging the gulf between the temporal and the eternal.

Another old doctrine which has been put out of fashion by our revolutionary thinking is conversion, not that it is said to be impossible, but it is pushed aside as unnecessary, as, indeed, something which ought not to be. The child, we are told, ought to develop naturally into a religious faith, and, as an example, is quoted the story of General Booth's daughter. Asked by her father if she had found Christ, she replied with the question, 'When did I lose Him?' Those born and brought up in the faith ought to pass on from grace to grace, never coming to Christ because they have never gone away from Him. Some indeed would go further even than this and be incredulous toward, or at least distrustful of, all sudden conversion. Stories such as we have from Dempster in his *Finding Men for Christ* meet with their scorn. The beginning of a new life! No, it cannot be that, for all progress is by a slow process of evolution. Wyatt Lang writes in the introduction to his *A Study of Conversion*: 'It is necessary at the outset to discard the opinion that Conversion is a sudden and uncontrollable phenomenon, for the evidence disproves this; there is no more need for sudden and extraneous intrusion into the mechanism of spiritual expression than into the mechanism of life-expression of any natural organism.'[1] Yet the same author, farther on in the same book, has to say, 'The decision to be effective must be conscious, for the self to be unconscious of its own decision seems to be a contradiction.' Then he goes on—and this is a most interesting confession—'But it frequently happens that a person is unconscious of his indecision. This appears to be the condition of many religious people; a grave weakness in religious bodies springs from the fact that a large proportion of their members have never made a decision. . . . The creative energy which therefore follows decision is lost.'[2] That illustrates the difficulty in which evolutionary thinking lands us here; it demands a steady growth and at the same time a definite point of decision. But decision is always a turning-point, a start of something new, and, therefore, a break with the past. This is so even if it be merely a decision to continue following the path we have taken hitherto, for there is now a difference, and a big difference; the path is taken deliberately and consciously which was formerly followed unconsciously, and therefore into our lives has come a thing which we never knew before, the temptation to wander from it. Such temptation is unknown to one who is acting unconsciously; it implies choice. To come to a decision, therefore, is to begin a new life, even though the decision be to continue living as before.

---

[1] P. 85.

[2] P. 12.

[3] P. 150.

[4] P. 140.

[5] P. 61 f.

Wyatt Lang, in the book referred to above, writes thus of John G. Paton: 'His religious convictions were accepted *en bloc* from his father. . . . He had no conversion-crisis because he was able to accept, through his father's persistent suggestion, the Reality of God's being and the self-ideal of the "servant of God," before he was twelve years old. . . . He gave himself to God and lived as God's servant, and never knew himself to be otherwise.'[3] With this statement, it is interesting to compare Mark Rutherford's description of Thomas Broad in *The Revolution in Tanner's Lane*. 'Being the child of pious parents, and of many prayers, he had never been exposed to those assaults of the enemy of souls which beset ordinary young men, and consequently had not undergone a sudden conversion.' But surely between John G. Paton and Thomas Broad there was a great gulf fixed, a gulf created by Paton's *decision* to follow Christ.

Truly, evolutionary thinking has here led us into Byepath Meadow and almost into Doubting Castle, and the grip of Giant Despair for Wyatt Lang is quite right in tracing the weakness of the Church to lack of decision on the part of members. So many regard conversion as a turning from evil ways, and, therefore, only for great sinners; but conversion is a turning from any path to Christ, even from the path of unconscious Christianity, and no one is truly a Christian till he has made that choice deliberately. Grenfell of Labrador, speaking of his boyhood days, and what he learned of Christ then, says: 'Religion meant to us a mother who brought Christ right into our family life just by doing daily what He would do in her place, and unquestionably into our personal lives too, even if we were not able to recognize and proclaim the fact vocally in those days, even to ourselves.'[4] Yet, in spite of that great advantage, he would never have been the man he is, if he had not faced the question of what to do with his life, and decided for Christ. Indeed, the danger of such a Christian training is just that the faith be accepted, but not made real. It was only in the fifteenth year of his ministry that Horace Bushnell had that glorious revelation of the gospel which made his later work so powerful and telling. Was not H. R. L. Sheppard right? 'Vital religious revivals are not concerned with changing men from unbelief to belief, but from mere belief to realization.'[5] Herbert Gray states the same fact. 'All my experience leads me to believe that a definite moral process, best described as surrender to God in Christ, is at the very heart of any liberating and reconciling religion.'[6] There must be a conscious decision, a definite break with the past. At the basis of any real spiritual life just as at the basis of physical life and of inanimate matter, lies catastrophe, discontinuity; a vertical conversion, not merely a horizontal one.

---

[1] P. 11.

[2] P. 199.

[3] P. 46.

[4] *What Christ means to Me*, 7.

[5] *The Impatience of a Parson*, 36.

[6] *Finding God*, 35.

Other examples of the need to rethink our thoughts and make allowance for discontinuity might be found in the doctrine of God, the doctrine of man, eschatology, even Biblical criticism, but space forbids, though one would like to dwell upon the harm that has been done by teaching that the conquest of sin is a gradual business in spite of the emphasis which the Gospels lay upon the *immediacy* of the devils' departure when Christ spoke the word.

Vesuvius is a fairly high hill, but the ascent is easy, being accomplished by train. The traveller leaves Naples by the ordinary Circum-Vesuvian Railway, and at Pugliano changes into Cook's line for the ascent. This is a definite break, a discontinuity. At first, however, it does not seem so; for the new line runs parallel to the old for some distance before turning up the hill. Higher and higher it climbs till it arrives at the foot of an incline so steep that no train could ascend it. However, the passengers are not required to change. An engine, working on the rack and pinion system, comes behind and pushes all up the slope. At the top of the gradient, this engine is left, and the journey continued, as before. In both cases there is change without break in continuity. At the foot of the cone, however, passengers change once more, this time into a funicular railway which carries them straight to the top, a break, and very decided change. Here we have illustrations of the three kinds of change which we find in both the physical and the spiritual realms, change with continuity, change with discontinuity, and discontinuity with no apparent change at first. It would be absurd to deny evolution, continuity, growth. There are many examples of steady development involving no breach with the past; but it is equally absurd to ignore discontinuity, catastrophe. It, too, can show many examples, the start of something new with a clear breach with the past, whether the difference be immediately appreciable or not.

Scientific investigation has shown that in the lower physical realm God uses both methods, and that neither can be said to be more normal than the other. Therefore, there is at least a presumption that He uses both in the higher spiritual realm. Slow growth is not always His process; the gospel is that if any man is in Christ, he is a new creation; and how catastrophic that new creation can be is seen in Paul himself.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Prayer.

By the Reverend Roderick Bethune, M.A., Aberdeen.

'He kneeled upon his knees three times a day.'—Dn 6[10].

Some time ago I travelled in a railway compartment with a gentleman whom I didn't know. During part of the journey he read from a very large book. After a time, however, he grew tired, I noticed. His eyes just refused to keep open. Do as he liked, his eyelids would keep coming down for longer and longer intervals until, finally, they stayed down, and he fell fast asleep. Do you remember watching your father fall off to sleep in his chair after that very busy day he had? He had been reading, you remember. But his eyes just wouldn't keep open. Highly amused, you watched his head roll to one side, and then to the other side, and then drop forward where it was content to remain. The book which he was reading began to slip, and slip, and slip, until, with a crash, it fell upon the floor. Well, greatly amused, I watched the same thing happening in the railway compartment. The large book which my fellow-traveller was holding began to slip, and slip, and slip, until it fell upon the floor of the carriage with a terrific bang! The noise wakened my companion who, pulling himself up, proceeded to deny (as perhaps your father did!) that he had ever been asleep! 'Well, well,' you say, 'there's nothing very startling about that.' You yourself, you declare, would have let the book fall had you fallen asleep, and perhaps you, too, should have denied that you were sleeping. Well, perhaps I should. But this is what I want you to know. When we reached our destination and I had returned home, I chanced to pick up a book in which there was an article about birds. Much to my surprise, and to my great interest, the writer was asking why it was that while a boy or girl cannot hold a book while asleep a bird doesn't fall off its perch when it goes to sleep. I had often watched my canary going to roost. It pulled one foot and leg close up to its body and, standing on the other foot, would tuck its head under a wing and go to sleep. No matter how long I cared to watch it, my canary never fell. Why? I was very eager to know, and so I read on. The reason, this writer suggested, is that the tendons of a bird's leg are so constructed that, when the leg is bent at the knee, the claws contract and grip whatever they encircle, positively refusing to let go until the knee is unbent again. My canary (like other birds) is a lot wiser than I thought! When it goes to sleep it bends the knee of the leg on which it is standing and, by throwing all its weight upon it, keeps it in that position. The bended knee I discovered, you see, gave the power to the bird to hold to whatsoever it desired.

With that thought in mind, I recalled the story of Daniel, of whom it is said that he kneeled upon his knees three times a day. You know what that means, of course? Three times a day Daniel prayed to God. Now the thing that impresses us about Daniel is his power to hold. In spite of many temptations he held to his faith in God and to his character. Many men tried to rob him of his character, endeavoured to weaken his grip upon his faith, but without success. For Daniel had a secret. He had discovered the secret of the bended knee. Whenever he felt a little weak, or unstable, he got down upon his knees, told everything to God and asked His help, and, as birds by bending the knee are able to hold things, so Daniel took a firmer hold of the things he cherished most.

You and I cannot hold things when we are asleep as birds can. But can't they teach us how to hold things while we are awake? Do you desire to hold the things which are most precious to you—honesty, truthfulness, honour, character? Then you, too, must learn the secret of the bended knee.

The Voice of Silence.

By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Lisbon.

'Be still, and know.'—Ps 46[10].

The month of November is not the brightest of months. 'November,' says Chambers's *Book of Days*, 'is generally regarded as the gloomiest month of the year.' Summer is far enough away to be forgotten, and Christmas is still a distant prospect. Hood finishes a poem on 'November,' in which every line begins, as the name of the month begins, with 'No,' by these doleful lines:

> No warmth, no cheerfulness, no healthful ease,
> No comfortable feel in any member—
> No shade, no shine, no butterflies, no bees,
> No fruits, no flowers, no leaves, no birds—
> No-vember!

Yet, with all its fogs and winds and rains, November has one distinction above all the months; it is the month in which on the eleventh day and at the eleventh hour there is a Silence of two minutes over all the land.

What is the use of this Silence? What is the use of any silence? A very great one. For silence is not just emptiness, the absence of speech or noise. It is a higher sort of speech; for voices can be heard in silence which noise keeps us from hearing, and there are things that can be said better by silence than by speech.

Mozart was once asked, 'What is the greatest effect in music?' His answer was, 'No music.' Addison, referring to a pause in a fine piece of music, said, 'Methought the short interval of silence had more music in it than any one short space of time before it or after it.' It was said of a famous bishop, 'His talk was rich and full; his silence full of inspiration.' The Bible says, 'Be still, and know that I am God.'

Once when the November Silence fell I was in North London in a noisy street. Motor-cycles clattered like machine-guns. Private cars purred on their way. Heavy lorries and buses thundered past. Horns hooted and yelped. Bells tinkled and clanged. Train whistles screamed. Piano-organs jangled. Horses' hooves clop-clopped on the wood blocks. All the orchestral noises of a great city made up the symphony of sound which beats on our ear-drums every day unceasingly, so that we hardly notice it till it stops.

Then it stopped. It was the Silence. Everything moving froze into stillness. Every noise sank into stillness. Then suddenly I heard a bird singing! Its notes dropped from the sky like a shower of silver music. It had been singing all the while unheard, its notes drowned by the city's noises. When they stopped, it got its chance to be heard.

That is the use of the Silence we keep on that month and day and hour, because on that day, hour, and month nineteen years ago four years of war and waste and suffering and heart-break came to an end. The Silence gives voices we need to hear their chance to be heard. They are the voices which call to us from the dead in their graves in many lands, and from the dead who had no graves, to take up their task, and work and pray for peace on earth.

The world is noisily busy over a host of problems that press. The hubbub of it all tends to drown these silent voices and make us forget that we are alive to-day because so many men died; forget that we are the children of a great sacrifice and that we must be worthy of it. The task of peace is everybody's task, and unless we take it up with all our heart, all the sacrifices of the War will have been a waste of precious ointment. Therefore we keep silence for two minutes at 11 a.m. every 11th of November that we may listen to the voices of our dead.

Ours is a noisy world; it needs silence and it gets very little of it. And because God knows our need and is mindful of us, He has not forgotten silence. He is like a harpist, who not only plucks the harp-strings to make them sound, but also lays his hand on them to silence their vibrations; and that, too, is part of the music.

He lays His hand on our restless wills and anxious minds and fretted nerves each night and sends sleep and silence; and the wastage of the day is made up in the silence of sleep. Nothing can make up for sleep. Nights on end without it would kill us. Wisely we have forbidden motor-horns to sound at night. Sleep and silence give God a chance to heal and build up our bodies.

Because we are not only bodies but souls, He has given us the silence of the Lord's Day. It is a very broken silence now, more's the pity, for it is as needful for the soul as sleep is for the body, and because body and soul are one we sin against both if we break in on the silence of sleep or the silence of God's Day.

God is always speaking to us, but like the bird on Armistice Day, His voice is drowned and unheard. It needed that silence for me to hear the bird, and it needs the Sunday peace for us to hear God. So He says, 'Be still, and know that I am God,' which is as much as to say, 'You never will really know Me until you are still.'

And just as the Two Minutes' Silence gives us a chance to hear the call of the men who died for us, so the silence of the Lord's Day is our chance to hear the call of the Christ, who died for us, in the silence of our own hearts, in the silence of the sanctuary, in the silence of His Holy Table.

It is told of the great actor Macklin that in his speeches he had three pauses, a short pause, a long pause, and a grand pause, and that he once knocked down a prompter, 'because,' he said, 'he broke my grand pause.'

The Two Minutes' Silence is the short pause; sleep is the long pause, the Lord's Day is God's grand pause. They have a big service to do us. Do not sin against the Silences.

The Christian Year.

TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Christian Unity.

[BY THE REVEREND DAVID CAIRNS, B.A., BRIDGE OF ALLAN.

'Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one.'—Jn 17$^{20-22}$.

I. These words of Jesus are the charter of the movement for Church Unity. Since He desired it, we must work for it; since He prayed for it, we must believe that His prayer will be answered. The command to seek for Christian Unity is of equal authority with the command to preach the gospel to every creature; both are part of our marching orders as Christians. And so we can apply a saying of James Denney's made on the subject of Foreign Missions to the subject of Church Unity—'Those who do not believe in it have no right to believe in it, for they do not believe in our Lord Jesus Christ.'

But, it may be objected, is not the unity of the Church of Christ a reality already, in spite of its external divisions? Cannot unity be experienced apart from union? It must be admitted that there is an inner unity which embraces all Christian people in so far as they serve the same Master, and remember each other in their prayers. But how poor a thing this unity is to-day, compared with what it might be! And it must be admitted that the outward divisions of the Church to-day are not merely superficial; they answer to a lack of inner unity and sympathy which is a hindrance to the Spirit of Christ. It is true that Christ did not speak of uniformity being necessary to His Church, and it seems as if the Apostolic Church had within it several varieties of order which may even have been an enrichment, but it cannot be questioned that the Early Church was one, not only in faith and inner experience, not only in prayer and mutual charity, but also one outwardly in face of the world as our Churches to-day are not. And until that outer and inner unity for which Jesus prayed is recovered, we must remain unsatisfied. How is that unity to be attained?

II. Each branch of the Christian Church possesses a certain tradition to which it wishes to bear witness. It believes that there are certain truths that it could never give up without disloyalty to Christ and the gospel. And there are certain other customs and beliefs which have become part of our very being as members of one denomination or another. In those traditions—I use the word in an absolutely general sense—there are things which are of crucial importance; there are other things which had a justification in past times, when they were a necessary protest, perhaps, against abuses. But now they are not of the same importance, in the sight of God; and we cannot always distinguish between the essential and the secondary. As we go forward into the Reunion Movement, in what frame of mind are we to carry with us these traditions of ours? Are we to insist that every one of them be retained, or are we to be ready to jettison them all? Both attitudes are wrong; no Church could adopt the second, while the first would make all hope of reunion impossible. What, then, are we to do? Is not the answer to be found in this prayer of Jesus, He did not just pray that His disciples might be one, but that they might be one *in Him.* We must believe that He knows what in our tradition will be of crucial importance to the united Church, and that He will guide us in our deliberations. Can we not trust Him to safeguard what is of real importance in our contribution?

When it does come to Reunion, the uniting Churches must be prepared to die as separate Churches, in order that new Churches may be born. A Church which is unwilling to die for the sake of the cause of Christ inevitably becomes a parasite. It continues to make claims on the loyalty and wealth of its members. But it has no more a right to these services, for it is no longer the Body of Christ, no longer ready to obey His Spirit, to work, to die for the Kingdom. If the death of a denomination as such is God's will, then much fruit will come of it.

Meantime, all our meetings and deliberations must be in a spirit of forbearance and love. And it is hard to maintain such a spirit in such meetings, when party loyalties and prejudices are easily roused and groups near to each other in sympathy may fraternize in talk on a basis of intolerant criticism of other groups. We must continue to expect that God will show a way through our difficulties, by showing us that we had misunderstood each other, or by bringing us to a point where we see that the apparently conflicting truths for which we were contending have all had justice done to them. It was a common experience at the Edinburgh Conference, that the Spirit of God was bringing the delegates into a unity which they had not dared to hope for. When impatience or arrogance of thought or word tended to separate us, then a gentler spirit came on us. And what united us most was the common attendance at worship, where we asked the forgiveness of God for all that had been unworthy, and joined in praising Him. The nearer that Christian men and women come to the Spirit of Christ, the nearer they are to the solution of the outstanding problems that separate them. Let us join as far as ever we can in worship with those who belong to different denominations, for that is the way in which we shall come into closest touch with the Spirit of Christ, and with each other.

III. The unity we are seeking is only a means to an end—'that the world may believe.' For the Church has no glory in itself, it has only the glory which God gives to it. And He does so only as it works for the Kingdom of God, only as it performs the duty assigned to it by Jesus, of bringing men to Him. The more we live in His Spirit, the more we shall see the differences that separate us in their true proportions. It has been asserted that it is the scandal of the Church that it emphasizes doctrine rather than life. But the Church must be concerned with doctrine, and it is only a scandal when its doctrine loses touch with life. We Churchmen are often terribly lacking in pity and sympathy for all the millions who are in the dark, the inhabitants of great cities who are adrift in the sea of humanity without anchorage in God, the heathen of Africa and China and India, the poor, the blind, the bruised, the broken-hearted. Any discussion on dogma, which has not behind it a burning memory of those eyes filled with despair, and those hands stretching forth from the darkness, is nothing more than a piece of ecclesiastical millinery. The Edinburgh Conference was reminded by Bishop Azariah of Dornakal on the opening day of the Conference, of the crucial situation of the Christian Church in India. 'We go to the peoples of India,' he said, 'and tell them that in Christ they will find the answer to their problems, and the unity that will transcend their divisions. When they come to us, and they are beginning to come, they say, "You ask us to join the Christian Church, but which of your Churches do you ask us to join? You say that in Christ there is unity, but you are divided amongst yourselves!" I beg you to remember in your discussions that this is the situation that we will have to face when we return home.'

IV. If we go forward towards unity in the spirit which is ready to accept the guidance of God's Spirit, determined always to seek for the truth in charity and humility and generosity towards those members of the Church with whom we are least in sympathy, then the day will come when the prayer of Christ for the Church will be answered, and the Divine glory will once more begin to shine forth from it, so that all men will be drawn to Christ. And the spiritual unity of the Church, working always by spiritual means, may then be able to serve a world on the verge of ruin through its fears and divisions.

There are many things of wonderful beauty in the world that make a man thank God that he is alive. But there is one beauty that shines beyond all others:

> Fair are the forests, fairer still the meadows
> Clad in the shining robes of spring,
> Jesus is fairer, Jesus is purer,
> Jesus our Saviour, Friend, and King.

And He said of those who were to be His Church, 'The glory that thou gavest me I have given them.' Look at His Church as you have never looked at it before, until you see it as it was meant to be, the fellowship of those who are living the new splendid life of adventure for God under the protection and guidance of the Spirit, a fellowship by means of which He challenges all that is evil, gives liberation to the captive and friendship to the lonely, a fellowship of men and women who think nothing about their own glory, but always about His, so that without their knowing it their faces shine with the reflection of the glory that they see in Him.

TWENTY-FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Sacredness of Strength.

By the Reverend J. G. Grant Fleming, D.S.O., M.C., M.A., Aberdeen.

'This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord. And when I saw it, I fell upon my face, and I heard a voice of one that spake. And he said unto me, Son of man, stand upon thy feet, and I will speak unto thee.'—Ezk 1^{28} 2^{1}.

Our text comes at the close of an amazing description of a vision which came to the prophet Ezekiel as his call to serve God. Many words are used by the prophet in an attempt to tell what he had seen—symbolic pictures that have little meaning for us to-day. But all his words and all his pictures merely illustrate his inability to describe the awfulness of the vision he had seen, and he closes on a simpler and more understandable note: 'This was the appearance of the likeness of the Lord. And when I saw it, I fell upon my face.' Whatever it was—the realization of a power, a presence, an overwhelming sense of holiness—it sent him to his knees in awe and reverence—'I fell upon my face.' But in the moments of utter prostration there dawned upon his soul a new assurance, the voice of God came to him saying, 'Son of man, stand upon thy feet, and I will speak unto thee.'

The greatest of men—men like Moses, Isaiah, Ezekiel, St. Peter, St. Paul, and the saints of Christendom are humbled to the dust in awe when the sense of the presence of God dawns upon them; but in the hour of reverence there comes a new power, a new dignity, new assurance, for the voice of God speaks, 'Son of man, stand upon thy feet, I would speak with thee.'

Man still has his visions of God; our minds go out to measure the universe; we attempt to understand eternity; we ponder on the mystery of life. Millions of words are written about our thoughts upon these things, but sometimes there comes a moment when man cannot write, when the magnitude and the wonder overwhelm and almost frighten him—when the mystery baffles him, the certainty of death crushes him, the insignificance and frailty of his own person bow him down; and yet, somehow, out of the very heavens there comes a voice to the soul within, 'Son of man, stand upon thy feet, for I would speak with thee.' 'You of all the creatures of My creating can comprehend the words I write in earth and heaven, stand upon thy feet and grapple with the mysteries of the universe—stand upon thy feet—thy God would speak with thee.'

Sometimes man's moments of abasement come as this vision came to Ezekiel—as the vision came to St. Paul on the Damascus road—come as a result of a sense of unworthiness in the presence of the purity, the holiness, and the righteousness of God. The vision of the Heavenly Father portrayed in the life and Cross of Jesus Christ is so overwhelming that man is awed; the wonder of such love claims his reverence, and in the knowledge of his own unworthiness his head is bowed in penitence and shame. The consciousness of sin and failure prostrates him before Almighty God, and yet again there seems to come a voice saying: 'Son of man, stand upon thy feet, I would speak with thee. Thou canst have the power to grapple with your failures, the grace to conquer sin, the possibility of new life now—Son of man, stand upon thy feet, I would speak with thee in Jesus Christ.'

Yes, it is true. Despite the vastness, the mystery, the amazing wonder of the universe which bends us low in awe; despite the consciousness of our sin and failure over against the holiness and righteousness of God, there is something within us—something greater than the universe—something greater than ourselves—something within us that calls us to our feet, to conquer our sinful natures and get the better of our failures to conquer the world for righteousness and truth, to grapple with the universe itself: 'Son of man, stand upon thy feet, thy God would speak with thee.' That is in itself a humbling thought—God calls the weakest of us to something great.

We come, week by week, into God's house to worship and adore. As we seek to live the Christian life, the meaning of the wondrous love of God portrayed in the life and Cross of Christ becomes clearer, and as we gaze at that Cross and think of that love, our own unworthiness and sin send us to the dust in awe and reverence, in penitence and shame, praying, 'God forgive us for our sin.' And in the hour of prostration there comes a voice, 'Thy sins are forgiven thee in Christ; lift thy head, stand upon thy feet, thy God would speak with thee.'

Yes, speak with thee, and the very first words are, 'Stand upon thy feet.' For the attitude of reverence, of penitence, of prostration, will only achieve that which is worth while if it is the prelude to a new beginning, if it means we rise again to new life for God. There is virtue in the dust if we lie not down in it; there is blessing in the humility that bows us down if we but bend to stand again; but it is possible to miss, in our penitence and prostration, the voice of God calling us to stand upon our feet.

I remember seeing a woman in India who travelled for over a hundred miles to some shrine, and each step of the way she measured her length in the dust. She seemed to have lost the sense of God in her prostrations. Sometimes the sense of sin, failure, insignificance, so overcome us that they fill our minds and keep us down, and we never rise above them. We repent in dust and in ashes, but it isn't the dust that is going to save us, it is the loving call of God. And God calls from above, not from below; look up—up at the Cross of My love, 'Stand upon thy feet, I have something to say to thee.' And the same voice speaks to us of strength and of courage and wisdom and power to grapple with all the things in life that would bow us down.

Do you remember how the maniac of Gadarea wished to sit at Jesus' feet after Christ had cured him, but the Master bade him stand upon his own feet, and sent him back to his own people to tell the great things that had been done in him. Prostration is the first step in our understanding of God's purposes, but the second is rising to our feet and striving to fulfil His purposes for us. Have you ever thought of that? God has something great for us to do. He is calling us to something higher than we have ever yet achieved, to truth, to righteousness, to a finer manhood, a fairer womanhood, to service for our fellow-men. 'Son of man, stand upon thy feet, I would speak unto thee.'

Perhaps the vision of God has never come our way; the knowledge of God's love in Christ has never dawned upon our souls; perhaps we have not realized our own need. We shall achieve nothing worth while in the spiritual life until we have passed through this experience. Let us remember the presence of God in the world about us, let us think of the power of God in the universe, let us dwell on the wonder of the Heavenly Father's love in Christ. We cannot but bow our heads in reverence then. Then let us turn our thoughts for a moment honestly upon our sin, our need, our unworthiness. We will go right down on our knees then in penitence and shame. I have never met a man who could stand honestly in face of the holiness of God unless he had prostrated himself in the dust of repentance, and God had called him to his feet.

When we are sincere in our sorrow for sin, God does give us the power to arise; and He also enables us to make the new effort glorious. He will do it now as we bow before Him in worship and in prayer. We may fear at first, but the fear passes, for He gives us confidence to stand before Him. 'Son of man, stand upon thy feet, and I will speak with thee.'

In these moments of silence, let all our words of theorizing pass away; and let us prostrate ourselves before the Heavenly Father in reverence and humility; and we will hear Him say to us: 'Son of man, stand upon thy feet, I would speak with thee'—words of hope and courage, words of good news, words of salvation from sin and the promise of new life. And in receiving them may we answer with our lives until, having done all, we stand before Him at the last when the mysteries of life will have been won through and we become perfect in His presence.

> Then shall we stand upon our feet
> In very deed, and gaze in wonder
> Upon our Heavenly Father's face.

Twenty-second Sunday after Trinity.

On Winning the Lost.

'My sheep which was lost . . . the piece which I had lost . . . my son . . . was lost.'—Lk $15^{6.\ 9.\ 24}$.

We would present these parables now as defining the obligation which rests upon Christ's disciples in union with Him to seek the lost. There is nothing plainer in the New Testament than the fact that He who came to seek and to save the lost still carries on that purpose through His disciples, in whom He dwells.

Christ gave these parables, not to sinners to convince them of their lostness, but to Pharisees and Scribes. These Pharisees were not consciously hypocrites, but men sincerely striving to preserve their personal sanctity. But they became so absorbed in externals that they actually came to that state in which they saw nothing in the really vital factors of any situation. Now the Lord Jesus hated Pharisaism just because He loved Pharisees—never forget that—and because He hoped and longed to save them from the unavoidable Nemesis of their own self-centredness. And He is not here speaking to them in irony when He calls them 'righteous' persons, 'just' persons. He says in effect to them, 'You have discovered your own need of relationship with God, and you have satisfied yourselves that by meticulous ritual observance that need is met. But you have lost sight of the fact that your mission in life concerns others who have not so found their need of definite relationship with God, and you are doing nothing to help them to find themselves. Your religion is altogether too self-centred, and on this account it has actually ceased to be religious.'

Now, first of all, we have the parable of the straying sheep; that is the parable of the thoughtless, those who yield to the herd instinct. They are like the one who, when asked, 'Where are you going?' replies, 'Nowhere in particular!' They are, in the main, heedless, restless, thoughtlessly keeping up with the throng, and bleating in unison its silly catch-phrases. They are mistaken, of course, and self-opinionated and pathetically self-satisfied. But they are of tremendous worth to the Shepherd!

We have given our young people laws enough, God knows. But have we ever sought to inspire them with enthusiasm for their true Leader? We have deplored—perhaps too publicly—their restlessness. Yet all the time we actually have the secret of which they are in quest. And were we filled with the Spirit of Jesus, doing the works that He did—ay, and greater works, as He promised we should—we should be impelled to go after them until we find common ground between our convictions and their yearnings.

Then there is the second group of lost ones. They are not a bit like sheep—not alert, restless, in almost perpetual motion; but rather are as insensible to their lost state as a coin that has fallen out of a woman's hand and rolled under a bed or a bureau. There are men who are exactly like coins out of circulation. They are making no contribution to life, for they are out of true relationship with God and with His will for which they were created. They are good enough when they are found and put into circulation. The metal is good; the image is there; the superscription has not been defaced. They just represent the ordinary folk, as like to each other as any one coin is like to another, who have got wrong ideas of life, who are selfish, narrow, self-contained and self-content. They are not doing harm to anyone, at any rate not wittingly. But they are altogether unaware that they were created for a life of serviceable fellowship with all God's other children, and that they are denying the very reason for their being. They have almost immeasurable potentialities for good or evil, as money, indeed, always has when it is in alliance with the great social forces of the world. But now, like the lost coin, they are useless. They are out of right relationship with God and life. They need to be convicted of the sin of living a life that is not increasing its dimensions, that is gaining nothing, that is accomplishing nothing in the world. They are apt to rely upon the fact that they are not influencing anybody for evil; that they are just living their own individual lives. We all of us know men who answer to this description; men who will only be saved if new thoughts of God's purpose, of life's value, and of ultimate morality in terms of individual responsibility, can be given to them. And it is well that we recognize that this will never be effected by exhortation, only by example.

Then, thirdly, Jesus said there are those who are like the younger son in the parable of the father and the two boys. He was lost, not because he went into the far country, nor because he became a spendthrift rioter, but because he did not, while in the home, come 'to himself.' He did not come to a realization of his own nature and the purpose of his being. Riotous living was not his essential sin, nor were extravagance and impurity. These were rather just the outcome of his wrong ideas about his father and about his own life. It was quite evident, from what Jesus tells us of him, that he had dwelt on what was due to him rather than on what was due from him; until at last he broke out into a demand for the opportunity of self-realization, and left home. Had he invested his money and used it to give him power to exploit his fellows, or to gratify his senses, or to live comfortably until the soul within him died, he would still have been just as far from 'himself' as he was in the far country—perhaps farther.

His father let him go! He let him go because he knew that only by going could he fulfil himself; that only by cutting loose from the home control could he ever ultimately find himself. One cannot believe that Jesus intended to convey the lesson that the young should for ever stay at home! It was probably the best thing this young man could do to leave home. And when he ultimately 'came to himself,' when he got the new and true view-point of life, he was at once made conscious, not of the sin of riotous living, not of the sin of squandering his money. He became aware of his sin against heaven, and of the unworthy conduct which had become his record by his outrage of life's true purpose. In the days of his ignorance he said, 'Give me what is mine!' In the days of his awakening, 'Make me what I ought to be!'

There are all round about us people—and young people in particular—who are misunderstood and suspected, and who are in consequence bored with religion and uninterested in anything connected with it. Unspokenly, they crave sympathy, and seek after self-expression. They labour under the misconception that any idea of God is merely prohibitory of the desires of their nature. They have gone out to seek in a far country what they failed to find in their homes, and what they failed to find also in the Christian Church. One of the reasons for their failure is that there is too much 'Don't,' and not enough 'Do' in the average presentation of the Christian gospel.

Now, last of all, Jesus tells us about another son, representative of the fourth class of people who are lost all round about us. These are the lost people who are to be found in all the Christian churches, the adherents of all forms of organized religion. And they are typified by a man who was lost by the sheer littleness and pettiness of the life in which he found contentment. If we look at his language we find it strangely familiar: 'I,' 'me,' and 'mine.' It is characteristic of a pitifully small mind without generosity or any thought beyond self. There is only one way to win such, who constitute quite the most obstinate and difficult case of the four classes here represented. Read again Christ's word: 'He would not go in. Therefore went his father out.'

It is quite impossible to say whether his father was successful with him. The inference is that he was not. But one thing is certain, that love and not indifference, long-suffering affection and not scorn, are the only forces that can break such an one down. And, thank God, they can.

Give me a faithful heart, likeness to Thee,
That each returning day henceforth may see
Some work of love begun, some deed of kindness
  done,
Some wanderer sought and won, something for
  Thee![1]

Twenty-third Sunday after Trinity.

Colonists of Heaven.

'For our conversation is in heaven.'—Ph 3^20^.

Words, like people, have their ups and downs, and like people they have more downs than ups. Here in our text we have a word which has come down in the world. What the translators of three hundred years ago meant to convey by using 'Conversation' was that the place to which we belong is heaven. The Revised Version is nearer our modern English when it translates 'Our citizenship is in heaven,' meaning that the city, the country, the state to which we owe loyalty is heaven. Paul, the Roman citizen, never forgot his Roman citizenship, nor, once he became a Christian, did he forget his heavenly citizenship. You remember that Andrew Melville told James VI. of Scotland, 'There are twa kingdoms in Scotland.' At the time of writing this Epistle, Paul was in Rome awaiting his trial. Looking out from his window on the great Mother City, he could not but remember the vast empire which she ruled over. Before his mind's eye there appeared the scattered outposts of Rome, in Britain and in Gaul, in Macedonia and Armenia, in Egypt and in Spain. In all these foreign lands the citizens of Rome were doing the work of the city, as pioneers, settlers, magistrates, soldiers.

---

[1] J. S. Holden, *The God-Lit Road*, 197.

With his mind coloured by this thought, he wrote these words to the Philippians: ‘We are citizens of heaven.’ What Roman citizens in lands far distant were doing for the Mother City, that the citizens of heaven were doing for the City of God. Dr. Moffatt brings out the full significance of our text when he gives the translation, ‘For we are a colony of heaven.’ Paul knew how the scattered Roman citizens were surrounded on the frontiers by aliens and enemies, their business and their pride to remain loyal to the Rome they had never seen. And so it was that the Philippians, the Ephesians, and all the rest, including Paul, and including ourselves, were the colony of heaven. We have never seen it. We are surrounded by aliens and enemies; it is our business and it should be our pride to remain loyal to the city that we have never seen, that city of God which has not known, and can never know, a decline and fall.

What does that loyalty involve? In the case of the Roman colonist, loyalty to Rome meant loyalty to Roman law. Every Roman colony and settlement lived, not according to the law of the indigenous inhabitants, but according to the law of the distant city. Paul had only to mention the fact that he was a Roman citizen to procure in Philippi itself his freedom from prison, and to secure his safety in Jerusalem when he was threatened by the mob. At its most distant borders, as at its centre, the Roman Empire was built on the majesty and the justice of Roman law. Christ’s empire is built on a similar foundation. The law of Christ’s kingdom is not native to this world. Whatever be the rules of life which govern the conduct of others in any land under the sun, these are not necessarily rules which should guide and control and govern Christians. Their loyalty is demanded to a higher law because they are colonists of heaven. Should it be the case that Rome expected and received from her absent exiled colonists what heaven cannot expect and does not receive from us? Rome, we may say, had blessings to confer; but is it not true that heaven also has blessings to confer? The whole of the laws of Christ’s Kingdom are shot through and through with promises of blessing. These blessings are not, indeed, material, but they are blessings which time cannot take away and which are ours when time is no more.

There is no need to describe the lonely outposts in which loyalty to the laws of the city of God is demanded. We have only to remember that the world in which we live is not a world in which the majority of the people are pure in heart, or peacemakers, or humble, or merciful, or prefer righteousness to profit. We have only to remember that, to realize that Paul’s picture of the lonely outposts of heaven is as true to-day as ever it was.

There was something more than Roman law which was binding on Roman colonists, there was Roman tradition, there was the Roman spirit. No doubt there were renegades amongst the Roman colonists, but the tradition and spirit of their forefathers had a long and glorious lease of life in their successors. As late as the time when Rome itself was threatened by barbarians and had to call in her far-flung legions to defend her walls, that handful of Roman legionaries who were left in England, men who had never seen the city, were true to the old spirit and tradition. It was they who inscribed the tablet found on the Roman Wall, ‘To the discipline of Augustus.’ The spirit of the founders of the city breathes still in these simple words. Pompeii, as we know, was a city of unrestrained luxury and vice, so different from the old Roman sternness and simplicity, but it is in the city of Pompeii that we find our best-known example of loyalty to duty. A sentry stood at his post while Vesuvius was in eruption, and was buried alive at his post, erect in the ashes.

We are colonists of heaven. We, too, are inheritors of a tradition and a spirit. The writer of these words was at the building up of the tradition which we have inherited. He was among the first of a long Apostolic succession of men faithful to the spirit of Christ. What was that spirit? From the very beginning it was a spirit of service and self-sacrifice, it was a spirit which did not count the cost; it was a spirit which even in the darkest night believed that the day would dawn, and that the kingdoms of this world would become the kingdoms of God and of His Christ. That spirit and that tradition are preserved and active and potent still. The Church has not forgotten, and cannot forget, its past, the glory of its prophets and martyrs and missionaries. There are, of course, renegades; the spirit of the world creeps in in places; but in other places, perhaps in the obscurest corners of all, there are those who erect their tablets to the discipline—not of Augustus—but of Christ; there are men and women, unnamed and unnoticed, who realize that they are colonists of heaven, not merely to receive benefits but to fight battles and to defend frontiers and to extend these frontiers till the City of God shall rule over all. But we had best admit that if there were nothing more to hand on than some of us could hand on, the next generation would see the Church, not old, but dead, and most of the dearly bought territory over which the flag of Christ had been raised by the toil and sacrifice of our fathers, surrendered.

For the Roman colonists there was not only the law, to which they were loyal, for the most part; there was not only the spirit and tradition of Rome, to which they were wonderfully loyal, for the most part; but there was Cæsar himself. The empire knew the value of that figure about whom it ultimately threw the cloak of a spurious divinity. As the empire grew old, more and more depended on the loyalty of the colonists to him; they were taught to worship him, and had he been worthy of such worship and such trust as he received, there is no saying what the course of history would have been—but he was not. We ourselves in our Empire know something of the value of that invisible bond of personal loyalty to the throne. It is almost the only bond that binds our dominions into one commonwealth.

The most important question of all is whether we are personally loyal to Jesus Christ, whether we have realized that the real bond is not between us and a city, but between us and Him. The real question is—How seriously do we take our oath of allegiance to Christ? The difficulty of keeping the law of Christ in this world is altogether too great; the tradition and spirit of Christ are far too high for us to maintain in these times, or in any times unless we are the servants and fellow-workers of a living Lord.[1]

Twenty-fourth Sunday after Trinity.

A Sermon for Remembrance Day.

By the Reverend Stewart Mechie, M.A., Edinburgh.

'And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.'—He $11^{39f.}$.

The roll of honour which is presented to us in this chapter contains a surprising variety of types. There are warriors like Gideon and Samson, national leaders like Moses and Samuel, prophetic figures of the ancient dispensation as well as a crowd of humble and heroic folk whose names are not recorded. Can we say they had anything in common? The writer to the Hebrews is in no doubt. To him they were all men of faith, men whose lives were dominated by a sense of the unseen realities, men who lived for ideals not for immediate gain, men who endured as seeing the invisible and counted life itself well lost in the service of the highest. As he sums up in the flowing phrases of our text, we seem to catch three notes which resound afresh this Remembrance Day.

1. **Disappointment.**—'These all . . . received not the promise.'

Scarcely any of those to whom reference is made in this roll of honour were successful in realizing their aims. Most of them were failures, albeit glorious failures. They had great promises held out to them; they cherished lofty hopes and made strenuous endeavours; but all apparently in vain. Samson and Jeremiah, differing so widely, join hands in a common lot of failure. Abraham at the end of his life owned nothing in the promised land but a grave. Moses got no more of it than a distant prospect from the top of Pisgah. The prophets passed on without seeing the great day of their confident declarations. 'Received not the promise' might be the epitaph of them all.

Must we not say the same of the men whom we especially remember to-day? The bitterness of the disappointment lies not merely in the fact that they did not live to see the end of the War, but much more in that the ideals they strove for have not been realized. No doubt in this as in all things human there was some mixture of motives; but the best of them—yes, the most of them—were led into the War by devotion to ideal ends. In that sense we may hail those who appear on our rolls of honour equally with those who appear on the roll of honour of the ancient Jewish Church as men of faith. But what can we say of their ideal ends? Perhaps they might have known that disappointment was in store for them. Certainly the Church of Christ ought to have known. Our Lord told us that men do not gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles. We might have guessed that modern war is not a plant likely to bear the peaceable fruit of righteousness. A war to end war, to uphold the sanctity of treaties, to crush militarism, to make the world safe for democracy—the very phrases have a cynical sound nowadays, for in these respects, one and all, the world is worse off now than it was before the War. The ends proposed by our men have not been realized. Their hopes have been bitterly disappointed. Whatever else we may dare to say of them, this at least is obvious and true—'received not the promise.'

2. **Achievement.**—'Having obtained a good report through faith.'

On the merely naturalistic or humanistic level there would be nothing more to add. 'Received not the promise' would be the last word. But it is not the last word for us, as it is not the last word for the Bible. That God must be taken into account in all our judgments for He is the dominant factor in every situation, such is the invariable testimony of Scripture. So when the writer to the Hebrews brings God in, so to say, and reviews his roll of honour against the eternal background, disappointment fades away before the brightness of achievement. God is quick to mark men of faith and give them a good report. They have their certificate of character as faithful ones, and that can never be taken from them. If God is, then faith counts for something. To live for ideals under a sense of the unseen is an achievement in His sight, whatever the apparent ill-success. Further, if God is, the lives of such men are not lost. They are safe in His keeping, treasured up in some unseen realm. Yea more, if God is as He has declared Himself in Scripture, the effect of such lives is not wasted; it is a contribution to God's great ends, a little impulse which, under His ruling and overruling, may count surprisingly in the end of the day.

---

[1] E. D. Jarvis, *More Than Conquerors*, 97.

May we not say the same of those whom we remember to-day? He, unto whom all hearts are open, has seen all the good that we have seen in them and more. Their faith has gained them a good report, and we can be sure that they themselves are not cast as rubbish to the void. Through their faith they achieved something in God's sight; yes, and, by His overruling, their devoted life and death may yet achieve something in the sight of all men and in strange and indirect ways promote these high ends which at this moment seem more illusory than ever. On the merely human level disappointment and failure are the dominant notes, but on the level of Biblical faith it is otherwise. By confident trust in the unseen realities, by seeing God in our situation and resolutely persisting in seeing Him there, we, too, like the writer to the Hebrews, may well hear achievement sound more loudly than disappointment this Remembrance Day. We may the more surely do that in view of the remainder of our text.

3. **Postponement.**—'God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.'

The writer to the Hebrews is no individualist. In his view the final goal of God's purpose is not an aggregation of individual perfections, but a perfected organism, a corporate entity, a body with many members, a temple in which each soul is a living stone. That is the consummation which all the New Testament sets before us—the family life of the Eternal Father and His redeemed children—and not till all are gathered in is it perfected. Till then there is something lacking to the bliss of the saints. True, we cannot speak of the consummation exactly as this writer does. He is expecting the end of the age and the final coming of the Lord very soon, and that expectation puts the emphasis where we can hardly put it. He tells his readers that something better is provided for them than for the heroes of the Old Testament, not in the sense that they will receive a better salvation than the faithful ones of old, but in the sense that their case is better, since they live in the Christian dispensation and the interval of waiting till the consummation is for them so very brief. We to-day, still awaiting the full coming of the Kingdom in power, are more impressed by the delay than this writer was, but we can join with him in the assurance that our lives and the lives of all the faithful departed of all the ages are part of one great movement. They, whether of the old dispensation or of the new, without us are not made perfect. There is something lacking to them, something that shall yet be made up, for God's purposes cannot be defeated. The ideals of men, in so far as they are His will, are not frustrated but merely deferred. Far from admitting that faithful lives are futile, since faith seems to bring them nothing more substantial than a certificate of character, this writer calls to his readers to hold fast their faith. The men of old have not lost their full reward, they are merely kept waiting. The full triumph of God's purpose is only postponed and their part in it is sure.

May we not again recall the men who fell in the War? They, too, are in the one great movement of Divine activity with us and those who went before us and those who may come after us. They cannot attain full blessedness apart from us. The realization of their ideals, so far as these were God-inspired, is not defeated but merely postponed. That means that we have our battle to fight. The best tribute we can pay them, the best service we can render them, is to carry on their fight of faith. We, too, must live for ideal ends, not for present or personal gain; we, too, must strive and endure as seeing the invisible. So shall we receive a good report through faith and gain our lives in losing them.

We must not, however, slavishly follow those who went before, but must listen to hear what the Lord will speak to ourselves. Samson and Gideon as men of faith were different in their actions from Isaiah and Jeremiah. Our men fought. It may be that God will call us not to fight. It may be that our war is rather against the root causes of war. Have we, for instance, sufficiently applied our minds and our wills to the internal economic frustrations, afflicting every country, for which war often seems the only or the easiest safety-valve? Here surely is a warfare more subtle and not less exacting. Not the method of our brethren's warfare necessarily, but the faith, the purpose, the completeness of devotion, these we must follow as God gives us guidance. As it is to Him we look for victory, so it must be to Him we look for light as to the manner of our warfare and the part of the struggle He has committed unto us. The blessedness of the faithful of all the ages and our blessedness, too, will lack completeness till that something better than He has provided is fully revealed and the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our God and His Christ. The promise still stands. If we give up in despair we shall be traitors to our brethren, traitors to the faithful of all the ages, traitors to our God.

Ecclesiasticus: A New Fragment of the Hebrew Text.

By G. R. Driver, M.A., Oxford.

Mr. Joseph Marcus has recently discovered and published a new fragment of the original Hebrew text of the 'Wisdom of Jesus ben Sirach,' under the title of *The Newly Discovered Original Hebrew of Ben Sira* (*Ecclesiasticus xxxii.* 16–*xxxiv.* 1), and he is much to be congratulated on the skill with which he has accomplished his task in view of the deplorable state of the manuscript (called E) which the facsimile betrays. The purpose of these notes, then, is to suggest alternative readings or interpretations of the text in seven passages where the editor seems to have gone astray.

32^{19} : [בלא עצה אל] תפעל דבר   ואחר מעשיך אל תתקפץ.

Such is the reading of E (restored at the beginning of the verse from B), and Marcus suggests that אל תתקפץ is a scribal error for אל התקצף 'vex not thyself,' which is the reading of B; for he knows of no Hebrew אתקפץ suitable to the context. It may, however, be explained from the Syr. *qpas*[1] Pe. 'drew back' (especially the hands, as in the Pesh. in 2 S 24^{16} = 1 Ch 21^{15}), and Ethpa. 'drew oneself back, shrank' (*e.g.* Syr. Aq. in Ps 32 = 33^{8}); thus the verse may be translated:

> 'Do nothing imprudently, and after thy deed draw
> not back,'[2]

i.e. be prudent in everything and finish whatever you begin.

33^{2} : ומתמוטט כמסערה אזנו. If the nonsensical אזנו is corrected to אוני = אֳנִי[3] 'vessel,' as Margolis suggests after the Gk. version, the meaning of the phrase is 'and tossed about as a ship by a storm' (cf. Gk. ὡς ἐν καταιγίδι πλοῖον); clearly כְּמִסְּעָרָה is an instance of the rare retention of another preposition after 'כ 'like.'[4] If, then, this explanation of E's כמסערה is right, it follows that B's במסער is an error for כמסער, which must be read כְּמִסַּעַר, and not כְּמִסְעָר, as Peters vocalizes it; thus the un-Hebraic מִסְעָר disappears from the language.

33^{4} : [הכן דברי]ך ואחר תעשה   ובית מנוח ואחר תגיה.

Marcus translates this verse, 'prepare thy words, and then shalt thou do; build a resting-place, and then shalt thou go forth (?),' reading בנה for בית. The first half of the verse is clearly rightly so rendered, but his version of the second half scarcely makes sense; at the same time it seems impossible to bring the Greek translator's *σύνδησον παιδείαν καὶ ἀποκρίθητι* into relation with the Hebrew text, even though ויאחז את־הבית is oddly enough translated *σύνεσχον τὸν σύνδεσμον* by the LXX (1 = 3 K 6^{10}), as Marcus rightly observes. The Hebrew text can only mean:

> 'Prepare thy words, and afterwards thou shalt act;
> And pass the night in rest, and afterwards thou shalt
> be bright';

---

[1] Cf. Brockelmann, *G.V.G.S.S.* i. § 88, for Hebrew ṣ = Syr. *s*.

[2] Cf. 4^{23} (D) and 4^{31} (A), where again קפץ occurs, in both places with various readings which suggest ignorance or misunderstanding of a rare word; but *difficilior lectio potior*.

[3] Cf. דופי = כְּפִי (44^{19}, in margin).

[4] Cf. Kautzsch-Cowley, *Hebr. Gramm.*, 376^{2}.

in other words, careful preparation of one's words paves the way for successful action, proper rest ensures a fresh outlook on the problems of life. I take בִּית as the imperative of a Hebrew בָּת, identical with the Aram.-Syr. בָּת 'passed the night,'[1] and מְנוֹחַ, as in the accus. case describing state or place; then I take תַּנְבִּיהַּ as the Hi. of נָגַהּ 'was bright,' used metaphorically (cf. הבליג).

33^{7} : אור שונה מעל שמש   [מה . . . . יו]ם יום כי כלו.

So Marcus reads the text without attempting to fill the gap in the first half, for which the Greek translator has *διὰ τί ἡμέρα ἡμέρας ὑπερέχει*, showing clearly that the Hebrew text lacks a verb. The Greek *ὑπερέχειν*, 'to excel,' is used by the LXX for, amongst other things, the Hebrew אדיר 'splendid' and גדול 'great,' and also for the Aramaic שנא 'excelled.'[2] In the second half שונה, which Marcus leaves untranslated, is the participle of a Hebrew שנה, which may be identified with the Arab. *sanâ*, 'shone brightly, flashed,' and the Eth. *sanaya*, 'was beautiful,' and is from the same root as the Acc. *šinītu*, 'dyed cloth,' and the Hebrew שָׁנִי 'scarlet.' This שנה 'was bright' and שנה 'was exalted' are in all probability at bottom identical roots; yet, as Jesus ben Sira has no hesitation in using the same root in both halves of a verse,[3] the original text may be confidently conjectured to have been:

אור שונה מעל שמש   [מה ישנה מיו]ם יום כי כלו

'how is one day more excellent' or 'brighter than another, when altogether
it is bright from upon,' *i.e.* 'draws its brightness from, the sun?'

in other words, how can one day excel another when all derive their brightness from the same source?

33^{13} : להתיצב מפניו חלק   [כן האדם ביד] עושהו.

Marcus translates this verse, 'so is a man in the hand of his Maker; he apportioned him to stand before Him (?),' following the Greek translator's *οὕτως ἄνθρωποι ἐν χειρὶ τοῦ ποιήσαντος αὐτοὺς ἀποδοῦναι αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὴν κρίσιν αὐτοῦ*. I suggest, however, that the Hebrew חלק has here the sense subsequently developed as normal in the Arab. *ḫalaqa* 'created,' which is preferable in the context. This use of the same verb is found again in several passages of this book, where, too, it has the support of the Greek translator—certainly in 31^{13} (חלק = *ἔκτισται*) 31^{27} (נחלק = *ἔκτισται*) and 38^{1} (חלק = *ἔκτισεν*), and possibly in 39^{25} and 40^{1} (חלק = *ἔκτισται*); in the first three passages this meaning is necessary, in the last two it is perhaps not so likely as that usually borne by the Hebrew verb but still conceivable.[4]

33^{27} : [על וע]בות חוטר תומכו.

The Greek translator's *ζυγὸς καὶ ἱμὰς τράχηλον κάμψουσιν* 'yoke and thong will bow the neck' evidently preserves approximately the true sense. Further, the form of the sentence, especially in the absence of a conjunction before חוטר, shows that this cannot be חֹטֶר 'rod, stick,' standing parallel with עֹל and עֲבוֹת and so denoting a third form of punishment, as Marcus takes it, but must be the predicate to them; it can then only be a participle vocalized חוֹטֵר, standing in the sing. number with a plur. subject[5] and governing the following תומכו as its subject. It does not seem possible to discover a Hebrew חטר meaning 'bowed' or the like, but there appears to be some possibility of some such meaning as 'galled.' In fact, this line of investigation suggests two possibilities. First, there is a verb of this form in the Aram. *ḥăṭar* 'fenced in, beat, scraped' and the Syr. *ḥṭar* 'carded,' both derived from *ḥûṭrâ* 'twig, rod, staff'; but, although such a secondary sense may well have been developed in a Hebrew חָטַר, the meaning is perhaps not quite appropriate to the picture. Second, there is a Syr. *ḥraṭ*, 'cut, scratched' (cf. Arab. *ḫaraṭa* 'scraped,' 'peeled'), with which it may be *per metathesim* cognate,[1] if indeed חוטם is not an error of transposition for חורט.[2] Then תומך (*i.e.* תֹּמֶךְ) must refer to the part of the body, either the neck or shoulders or else the skin, which the rope and the yoke thus injure, and the only possible explanation of it which I can suggest is that it is the same word as the Acc. *tikku* 'neck.'[3] Thus על ועבות חוטר תומכו may be translated, at any rate provisionally, 'yoke and rope gall his neck,' which makes perfectly good sense in the context.

---

[1] Also Bab. *bātu* (=Ass. *bādu*) 'to pass the night.'

[2] In Dn 7^{23}, where the LXX rightly render די תשנא מן־כל־מלכותא by *ἥτις ὑπερέξει πάσας τὰς βασιλείας* 'which shall excel all the kingdoms.' Professor Thomas (in *Z.At.W.*, lii. 236–8) has shown that the Hebrew שנה has a similar meaning in Pr $24^{21.22}$ and Est 2^{9}, being cognate with the Arab. *saniya* 'was exalted,' with which also the Syr. *šan(n)â* 'sublimity,' is connected; and in a private letter he adds Pr 5^{9}, where שְׁנוֹתֶךָ is parallel to הודך 'thy majesty' to these passages.

[3] *E.g.* 3^{23} 4^{2} $8^{12.13}$ 11^{27} 37^{1} 40^{4} 41^{13} 45^{25}.

[4] Nöldeke (in *Z.At.W.*, xx. 85–6) says that the development of the meanings of the √חלק is from dividing or apportioning to appointing or ordaining and thence to creating, which however is not quite reached in Hebrew usage (although the Greek translator employs *κτίζειν* for it), and that it cannot therefore be regarded as an Arabism in this book. Smend (*Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt*, ii. 277–8) says that the sense of creating is derived rather from that of polishing or working into shape (as it is in the √ברא) than from that of dividing or apportioning.

[5] Cf. שמן וקטרת ישמחלב (Pr 27^{9}).

33^{31} : . . . כי במשפ.

With a powerful magnifying-glass I can with a fair degree of certainty make out . . . כי כנפשך, which corresponds nicely with the Greek translator's *ὅτι ὡς ἡ ψυχή σου ἐπιδεήσεις αὐτῷ* (though in the next verse, as the clauses are here interchanged in the Hebrew and Greek texts), so far as it goes.

The interpretations of these seven passages here suggested rest in seven cases on the application of the principles of comparative philology to problems of lexicography (קפץ, מנוח, בית, נגה, שנה, חלק, חוטר, תומך), once on the true vocalization of a word (כמסערה), once on a different reading (כי כנפשך), and once on a conjectural restoration (ישנה) of the Hebrew text, and they are put forward in the hope of explaining the text without having recourse to emendation.

---

[1] Metathesis in roots containing a sonant and a palatal is well attested (see Brockelmann, *G.V.G.S.S.*, i. § 98 *c ε*, g^1 *δ*).

[2] Cf. 33^{18} for such a mistake on the part of the copyist of this MS. (עלמת for עמלת).

[3] Acc. *ḫaššu(m)* = *ḫanšu(m)* = *ḫamšu(m)* = Hebrew חֲמִישִׁי 'fifth,' and Acc. *ikku(m)* = Syr. *ḥek(k)â* = Arab. *ḥanaku(m)* 'gum' illustrate the assimilation here postulated in the Accadian as compared with the Hebrew word.

Ought We to Consider the Consequences?

By the Reverend A. Gordon James, Lytham St. Annes, Lancashire.

In estimating the moral worth of any action, to what extent is it necessary to take into account the possible consequences that may follow? This is a question which all thinking men are bound to consider, but to which many of us avoid giving a direct answer, either because we assume that the answer is generally known and accepted, or because not having thought the matter through, we have no answer to give. An effective example of the way in which this particular issue is evaded is plainly seen in the controversy that is raging in respect to what is known as Christian Pacifism. Almost every argument on both sides of the subject under discussion has been worn threadbare. Yet no serious attempt has been made by the Pacifist to justify, on intellectual grounds, his contention that war being unchristian, he is compelled to renounce it, *whatever the consequences to himself or to others*. On the other hand, those who assert that things being as they are, the Christian cannot renounce war *lest the consequences bring disaster*, are content to leave the matter there, without any explanation as to why they find it necessary to consider the consequences at all. Yet surely, this is the one point of difference between the 'Christian' Pacifist and the 'Christian' non-Pacifist. This is the ground of their disagreement. They cannot afford, therefore, to disregard the serious problem which lies at the root of their difficulties.

Every volitional action has to be considered from two points of view. First, is it right? That is to say, is it in harmony with an agreed standard? As the ethical student would ask, is it according to rule? Second, is the action good? That is to say, is it in harmony with that supreme and ultimate end to which life is or ought to be directed? If we were dealing with all actions of every kind it would be necessary to discuss the validity of our standards and the nature of the *Summum Bonum*, which is the end we have in view. We should be required, further, to enquire whether there is one ultimate end, or whether men can be satisfied with a diversity of aims, not all of them related to one another. For our present purpose, however, it will be sufficient if we move within the range of ideas that are specifically Christian and thus limit our investigation to those actions that are wrought with a Christian intention and governed by a Christian motive. Right conduct, therefore, may be defined as conduct which is in accord with the teaching and spirit of Jesus Christ, who constitutes the standard for all Christian people. The ultimate end may be summed up in the phrase 'the Kingdom of God,' which is the supreme good for all those who acknowledge the authority of our Lord. If it be objected that both the Christian standard and the Christian end need further definition and explication, it will be sufficient to reply that all that is necessary for the present argument is the acknowledgment of the fact; namely, that for the Christian, the final authority is in Christ and the ultimate end of all living is the reign of God.

Here it is necessary to distinguish between two classes of action for which the individual can be held responsible. The first may be called personal action, that is, action which a man takes on his own behalf, in response to what he believes to be right and to serve an end which he believes to be good. It is true that others may be affected by what he does, but he does not act primarily on their behest or at their bidding. He exercises his freedom of choice between right and wrong, between good and evil, for himself and himself alone. The second class may be called trustee action, that is, action which a man takes on behalf of others. He may be a member of Parliament, responsible to his constituents, or the director of a company, responsible to his shareholders. In such event, he will consider, not merely what is right or good for himself, but whether he is acting in the best interests of those who have reposed their confidence in him for certain well-understood reasons. Even if they have allowed him complete freedom of action, he is still bound in honour to consider their wishes so far as he knows them; and his choice will be limited in that respect. There is a sense in which we are all trustees, for no man liveth to himself and we are bound together by mutual obligation. But the distinction between personal and trustee action is none the less real; and in practice it is an important factor in the regulation of conduct and must be borne in mind in criticising the actions of others.

So far as the consequences of any action are concerned, one further distinction must be made, namely, between consequences that are immediate and apparent and consequences that are remote and not always apparent. The immediate consequences of a refusal to bear arms at a time of war, for example, may be imprisonment for the individual, or, if there are many such cases, national defeat and humiliation. The remote consequences are more difficult to estimate and therefore more open to conjecture. Some will urge that international disarmament will result, others that the world will revert to barbarism. We are now moving in a world of prophecy, or, as some would say, of speculation. There can be no certainty, save that of faith, which rests, not upon the knowledge of the way events will move, but upon what we believe to be the character of God.

We are now in a position to consider a particular action. The factors to be taken into account are: (1) Is it right, that is, is it in accord with the Christian standard? (2) Is it good, that is, is it directed towards the establishment of the Kingdom of God? (3) Is it my own personal act, or have I to pay regard to the wishes of others? (4) What are the probable consequences? If we can find satisfactory answers to these questions we are able to estimate the ethical value of the action. But it is clear that the questions are not of equal importance: they do not all stand on the same level. They should therefore be taken in order, each factor falling into its proper place, otherwise the final result is likely to be incorrect.

If the answer to the first question is 'No,' then there is no point in proceeding further, for any action not in accord with the Christian standard must by the Christian be condemned, even though it have a good end in view or be a trustee rather than a personal act. This rules out the maxim that it is sometimes prudent to do evil that good may result, which may be worldly wisdom but is certainly a violation, not only of Christian principle but of ethical rectitude. It also rules out the specious plea that what is right for the individual may be wrong for the community or vice versa; for a trustee can never act on behalf of others on a lower level of morality than he would act for himself, without affronting Christian standards. A negative answer to the question, 'Is it right,' therefore, settles the matter once and for all and whether or not the consequences are likely to be agreeable does not arise.

On the other hand, if the answer to this question is 'Yes,' or even 'I do not know,' we have then to proceed to the second, 'Is it good?' Again, a negative reply is decisive, for the Christian cannot act in disloyalty to the purpose of God, which is the coming of His Kingdom. An uncertain answer to questions one and two will also be decisive, on the ground that the Christian is never left entirely in the dark, but relies upon the guidance of the Holy Spirit. If this guidance is not forthcoming, if he does not know whether any proposed action is right or good, he will naturally pause.

The third question is not so difficult as it appears. A trustee is a person in whom others repose trust. If he acts against what he believes to be right and good, he violates that trust, even though his constituents may not concur with his judgment. In this event, he has no option but to resign his position and pass over its responsibilities to another. To argue that one is compelled to adopt a lower standard of ethics in the capacity of a trustee than in matters of personal conduct is to violate the conditions of trusteeship. If this were always recognized, a great many practical difficulties would be avoided.

Finally, we come to the question of consequences. Assuming that an action is judged right and good, that is, in harmony with the Christian standard and directed towards the establishment of the Kingdom of God, but that its immediate consequences are likely to be painful to the individual and embarrassing to the community, whilst its more remote consequences cannot be accurately discerned, to what extent should they be taken into account? So far as the individual Christian is concerned, the answer is clear and unambiguous. He must never be deterred from doing his duty, whatever the cost to himself. His loyalty to Christ demands that he should deny himself, take up his cross and follow his Lord. If his action is likely to cause pain to others, he must satisfy himself, not merely by reference to his own conscience, but by diligent examination of his standards and by due regard to the counsels of the Church, that he is forming a correct judgment under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. When he is satisfied on these points, he must risk hurting his friends and neighbours or causing annoyance to the community. It was in relation to circumstances of this order that Jesus said, ' I came not to send peace, but a sword,' a text that is sorely misunderstood and misapplied. As for the remote consequences, these lie within the will of God, and we must be content to leave them there.

The application of these principles to particular cases need not detain us. That they have a bearing upon the controversy between Pacifism and its opponents is obvious. But by keeping strictly within the range of Christian ideas and by proceeding cautiously step by step, it ought not to be impossible to arrive at definite conclusions. When these conclusions are reached, the individual Christian will know how to act upon them and the Church will be more wisely instructed. At present we are all exposed to moods of feeling which lack a rational background. Our safety lies in a close examination, not merely of personal motive, but of the standards of our faith and the end we have in view. The question of consequences will then be put into its right perspective and we shall see our way more clearly.

There remains one objection to what has been stated above, and this cannot be ignored, though it is not possible to deal with it fully within the limited scope of this article. It may be urged that action, whether individual or corporate, is never rational, but is the result of deep-seated instincts of which we are never fully conscious. We act first, and rationalize afterwards. This may be true; indeed, it is true. But we are entitled to examine our conduct, and, so far as we are able, to establish it upon principle. We must not assume that psychology has driven ethics completely off the field. The two must be correlated and within the sphere of Christianity they can be. Is it too much to say that when we have established our principles we can afford to leave our instincts to take care of themselves? If the psychologist objects to so sweeping a generalization, at least we may respectfully remind him that there are other sciences besides his own, and that a true philosophy of life must embrace them all. At any rate, it will do us no harm to base our conduct upon the principles of revealed religion. If we go astray, the fault will not be in our stars, but in ourselves.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Christianity and the Political Order.[1]

THIS very large book is a sequel to the author's *Evangelische Wirtschaftsethik*, which was published nearly ten years ago. The present volume was not specially written in view of the recent Oxford Conference on Life and Work, but is offered as a German contribution to the discussion of such problems. The English reader finds much in it that is already accessible in English, and a curious indifference to some of the important writing by

---

[1] *Evangelische Ethik des Politischen*, by Georg Wünsch, Professor der systematischen Theologie in Marburg (Mohr, Tübingen; 1936).

English experts on State and Church; Mr. Lloyd George is once mentioned, but there is not any suggestion of acquaintance with Dr. Figgis, the brothers Carlyle, Maitland, Creighton, or Dean Inge. However, Professor Wünsch is writing for his own people, and, if one makes allowance for the somewhat provincial outlook upon a central theme, his survey becomes useful even to foreign readers at more points than one.

Attaching himself to Luther, whom he reproduces with critical sympathy, the author begins with an introductory section, which posits the Kingdom of God as vitally connected with faith in the order of Creation; his brief discussion of the Sermon on the Mount argues this forcibly against the Marcionitism of Tolstoi and later theorists. The second section (pp. 92–370) is an historical sketch, mainly for Germans, of the Church and State problem from the Reformation to Frederick the Great, Bismarck, and the present régime, with side-glimpses at sects like the Quakers and Levellers in seventeenth-century England. Here Professor Wünsch is not bound to the chariot wheels of Troeltsch, fortunately; his analyses are independent and sometimes pungent. The third section (pp. 371–655), which is the heart of the treatise, discusses factors like race, nationality, and economic questions in their relation to religion, the purpose being to justify Nazi Socialism as politically inevitable no less than fruitful, with just freedom for evangelic Christianity of a courageous patriotic type to breathe. National Socialism, he significantly remarks, seeks the national unity on a positively religious basis, but on no confessional basis (p. 652). The implicit or, indeed, the explicit theism of the régime represents a 'God who is the source of confidence for the political man. . . . And this faith is the faith of the first article in Christianity, the faith of trust in God, the Lutheran, reforming faith,' which inspired Cromwell, Schleiermacher, and Frederick the Great. The apologia is worked out neatly, prudently, and with learning.

To such a large volume a more adequate index than eleven pages of names and subjects ought to have been attached, for the book is one to which the reader will refer for certain discussions, to which the contents afford no clue.

Two fresh contributions to the *Handbuch zum Alten Testament*[1] have appeared. Professor Galling has completed the serviceable lexicon which has been already noted in our pages. It manages to furnish the reader with the essential data on topography and archæology in short articles, some of which are aptly illustrated; the article on 'sarcophagus' in this part is an excellent specimen of the compressed but instructive workmanship which the editor has succeeded in putting into his manual.

The Dutch scholar, Dr. Gemser, now at the University of Pretoria, has edited the Book of Proverbs for the *Handbuch*. The opening collection (1–9) is placed between the great prophets and the age of Ezra; the Solomon collection (10–22^{16}) and the 'Hezekiah' edition of Proverbs in 25–29, which originally were independent, are older; of the appended collections, that in 22^{17}–24^{22} has used the Egyptian Amen-em-ope maxims, though Israel's wisdom is pronounced to be less intellectual and more ethical than Egypt's. The book is thorough and concise, with more attention paid to the etymology than to the ethics of the Proverbs, upon the whole. But Dr. Gemser sometimes remembers interpretation in the midst of his philology. Thus he has a word to say on 'surely in vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird'; the point is, that a silly bird will entangle itself in a net lying before its very eyes, as a sinner against his better knowledge lets himself be mixed up with evil company to his own ruin. JAMES MOFFATT.

New York.

The Faith and Order Conference.

IN connexion with the Faith and Order Conference in Edinburgh in August four Commissions had been preparing material for discussion. One has dealt with the relation of the Church and Revelation. This volume[2] has been prepared to accompany the Report, and deals in a selection of essays with the subjects there discussed. A wide view is taken of the subject; and Ministry, Apostolic Succession, and the Sacraments are included. In the first part the method of study is discussed, and a general survey is given; in the second special researches are offered in German, French, and English. The English contributor seeks to relate the theory of the Apostolic Succession to the essence of the gospel; the German contributor seeks to prove that the relation of the Apostles to the Lord was personal, and could not be transferred.

---

[1] *Biblisches Reallexikon*, Bögen 11–18, und Titelbögen, von Kurt Galling; and *Sprüche Salomes*, von B. Gemser (Mohr, Tübingen; M.3.45).

[2] *Die Kirche Jesu Christi und das Wort Gottes; Ein Studienbuch über das Wort Gottes als Lebensgrund und Lebensform der Kirche*, herausgegeben von D. Wilhelm Zöllner und D. Dr. Wilhelm Stählin (Furche Verlag, Berlin, 1937).

A Protestant contributes as objective a study as possible of the Roman Catholic position. The Orthodox is also stated. The longest contribution deals with Calvin. While the ultimate authority of the Word of God, God's self-revealing activity, not confined to the Scriptures, is insisted on, verbal inspiration is expressly repudiated by several of the writers. But there are a few allusions which seem to assume that the early stories in Genesis are authentic history. What one does regret is that this volume indicates that most of the writers desire to 'stay put' in their denominational position, and are not endeavouring to find the common witness to the world of a united Church, one in the Word of God.

In the *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuse*, Professor Bernard Ménégoz of Strasbourg University writes a most interesting article on 'Résurrection.' It is a plea for a theology, for which the Resurrection is central and determinative. He first of all discusses the relation of faith in the Resurrection to historical and then to physical science, and insists that the Resurrection belongs to a supra-historical and a supra-natural order, and can neither be explained nor denied by them. The record, which belongs to 'the three-storey cosmology,' is to be taken symbolically, and an increasing materialization in the tradition must be recognized. Having justified against these objections the faith in the Resurrection, Professor Ménégoz discusses its relation to theology. He contrasts the theology which gives full significance to the Resurrection—the *divine dynamic* through the Risen Lord in present human experience—with the theology which looks back to the earthly ministry, and the theology which looks forward to the end. I may add that I find myself in close agreement with this point of view, and commend it for serious consideration.

In the same journal (pp. 196–209) appears an article by another Strasbourg teacher, Jean Hering, on 'Kyros Anthropos,' in which he discusses the Jewish conception of the Heavenly Man, or Second Adam in Ro 5^{12-21}, and in 1 Co 15^{45-49}. He contends that Hebrew usage allows the rendering of εἷς as equivalent to δεύτερος. He finds the same conception in Ph 2^{6-11}, a hymn in strophes of three lines each, and full of Aramaisms according to Lohmeyer. He contends that μορφῇ may be rendered *image*, as there is evidence of the equivalence of μορφῇ and εἰκών as renderings of the Aramaic *demoutha* or *tsalma*. The Second Adam bears the divine image as does the first, but this does not mean equality with God, as many theologians have taken the word μορφῇ to involve. Accordingly, the meaning of the passage is given as follows. 'The heavenly pre-existent Adam could have conceived the senseless project of seizing by force the equality with God which he did not yet possess. Instead of that, he humbled himself, and it is this which made possible both his redemptive work, and his elevation after death' (pp. 201 f.). The last words of v.^{8}, 'the death of the cross,' have been added by Paul, as they do not fit into the framework of the strophe. The heavenly is thus contrasted with the earthly Adam who fell before the temptation of the promise, 'ye shall be as God.' The exaltation won by the humiliation was the Lordship which in 1 Co 15^{24-28} is declared to be temporary. If this interpretation is correct, it will deliver Christology from a number of *Kenotic* theories, which Ritschl rightly described as mythology. I have never been able to use this passage as it has often been used. Limits of space here forbid my discussing what value this conception of the Heavenly Man can have for Christian dogmatics. I have been inclined to regard it as a mere myth.

A. E. GARVIE.

London.

Contributions and Comments.

'Let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican' (Mt. xviii. 17).

THESE words (in Moffatt, 'Treat him as a pagan or a taxgatherer') form the concluding injunction of a passage giving directions for the treatment of a 'brother' or fellow-Christian who has fallen into sin. The usual explanation is that, if the offending brother will not listen either to your own remonstrance or to the authoritative rebuke of the Christian congregation, your duty is to treat him as outside the pale of Christian fellowship—to break off intercourse with him. To many to-day such an interpretation appears profoundly unsatisfactory and inconsistent with the usual teaching and practice of Jesus. If a mere Jewish rabbi had been speaking, they would indeed be probable. But Jesus is represented as using words of almost uniform respect and commendation in His references to *Gentiles*, implying clearly that they were nearer to the Kingdom than were the Jews. He chose Gentile-infected Galilee as the scene of His works of healing, and had especial blessings for the Samaritan and the Roman centurion. As regards the hated *tax-gatherers*, far from holding no intercourse with them, we know how, in defiance of Jewish custom, He habitually took His meals with them.

What, then, do these words mean? I suggest that the true interpretation is to be found in Mt 5^{43-48}, the passage giving the Christian expansion of the old precept to love one's neighbour as oneself. As far as I can discover, this is the only other place in the Gospels or indeed in the New Testament, where 'tax-gatherers' and 'Gentiles' are brought into any kind of juxtaposition. This indicates at any rate a presumption that this portion of the great Sermon may throw light on Mt 18^{17}. Let us consider why Gentile and tax-gatherer are introduced into a passage of which the cardinal words are the new command to 'love your enemies and pray for your persecutors' (5^{44}). After 5^{45}, from which we gather that God has loving care over 'enemies' and 'persecutors' and that these classes of people may be otherwise described as 'wicked' and 'unjust,' we come to two pairs of questions which are clearly meant to furnish commentaries on the above-mentioned command to love and pray for enemies and persecutors.

To the English reader the point of v.^{47} is nearly lost by the usual rendering 'salute your brethren.' The two Hebrew words usually employed to express salutation literally mean 'bless' and 'ask for the peace of' respectively; and in the East, then as now, a salutation either verbally or implicitly contains a prayer for the person addressed—a recommendation of him to the Divine care. This salutation of peace would not be conferred by a strict Jew upon a Samaritan or other Gentile; nor would a Samaritan (say) confer it usually upon a Jew. So Mt 5^{47} would gain immensely in point (in relation to the rest of the passage) if we translated, 'And if you pray only for the peace of your brethren.' Further, in the quotation from Leviticus in v.^{43}, the primary sense of 'neighbour' (as opposed to 'enemy') is almost certainly 'fellow-Jew.' It is therefore probable that the 'brethren' of v.^{47} also means primarily 'fellow-Jews.'

This rendering makes the close connexion of vv.$^{46.\ 47}$ with v.^{44} quite obvious. The effect of the four questions is an injunction to love those who do not love us, so that we may rise above the level of the tax-gatherer, who had no love for his victims, coupled with another to pray for those who are alien to our race and religion, so doing better than the Gentile who would not pray for the Jew. But why these special references to tax-gatherers and Gentiles? Surely because the words are merely variants to the 'enemies' and 'persecutors' whom we are told in v.^{44} to love and pray for. To a Jew 'Gentile' and 'enemy' were almost synonymous terms, and the exaction and cruelty of the tax-gatherer is not unfitly described as a kind of 'persecution.' If we make this equation, we have, it is true, a transposition in vv.$^{46.\ 47}$ of the love towards enemies and prayer for persecutors of v.^{44}. But this is not important, because the ideas of love and prayer include and do not exclude each other. The conclusion to which we are led is that to the Jewish disciple of the day the words 'love your enemies and pray for your persecutors,' whatever else they meant, were intended to mean 'you must love and you must pray for both the Gentile and the tax-gatherer.'

This form of the new law of love at once suggests an illuminating interpretation of our text, 'Let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the tax-gatherer.' The whole passage (18^{15-17}) therefore means that, if all other legitimate methods fail, if your Christian brother will attend neither to your own remonstrance, nor to that of friends, nor to the authority of the Church, your only resource is—not to spurn him, break off intercourse or treat him as an enemy is usually treated, but to treat him and regard him as some one to be made the special object of love and prayer, just as the Master bade you love and pray for the Gentile and the tax-gatherer. This interpretation not only furnishes a parallel to Mt 5^{43-48}, but well expresses the spirit of our Lord's teaching and example—a condition which the usual interpretations (as to breaking off intercourse, etc.) do not. Jesus came to teach us, among much else, that when all other legitimate methods of dealing with wrongdoing fail, there always remain for us the 'last weapon' of love towards and prayer for the offender.

Stephen Hobhouse.

Broxbourne, Herts.

The Translation of 2 Timothy ii. 26.

καὶ ἀνανήψωσιν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου παγίδος ἐζωγρημένοι ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου θέλημα.

The publication of Professor E. F. Scott's admirable commentary on the Pastoral Epistles is an incentive to the re-examination of certain passages which have been variously understood by translators and exegetes down the centuries to the present time. This passage is a notorious *crux interpretum.* Greek fathers, scholars of the Reformation period, expositors of our own time, differ in their understanding of the text.

Dr. Scott is commenting on Dr. Moffatt's translation. Here the commentator differs from the translator. Both differ from Theodore of Mopsuestia, the Latin Vulgate, and the Syriac Peshitto, with which Luther, Tyndale, the Great Bible, and the Authorized Version broadly agree. Of the three English versions the Great Bible seems the most accurate in rendering ἐζωγρημένοι, 'holden captive,' with Theodore and the Vulgate. Theophylact does not distinguish between ἐζωγρημένοι and ζωγρηθέντες, and, moreover, he takes the clause as referring to the action and will of God. If the characteristic meaning of the perfect participle is attended to, it is more natural to understand the clause as explanatory of the devil's snare. 'The most natural sense might seem to be that they escape the devil's snare after he has entrapped them and forced them to do his will.' So Dr. Scott affirms, and rightly affirms. It is the most natural sense: but why not the correct sense? Dr. Scott finds an objection in the two different Greek pronouns αὐτοῦ and ἐκείνου, regarding which he says, 'By his employment of these two terms the writer seems purposely to distinguish two agents—the devil and God.' Is it really so? There are clear instances of ἐκείνου quickly following αὐτοῦ and yet referring to the same person, *e.g.* Plato, *Phaedo* 106 B, and *Protagoras* 310 D (see Parry, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 61). It is an idiom of older Greek, which has disappeared from Modern Greek. In Mt 26^{24}, καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος is thus translated (B. and F. Bible Society text), καλὸν ἦτο εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκεῖνον ἂν δὲν ἤθελε γεννηθῇ. Whereas in the older Greek the less emphatic term precedes the more emphatic, in the modern language the sequence is reversed, and αὐτός as subject is omitted. It is both natural and idiomatic to take αὐτοῦ and ἐκείνου here as referring to the same person.

Dr. Moffatt, following the Theophylact tradition, refers both pronouns to God. He attributes a rare meaning (found in Homer) to ἐζωγρημένοι, 'brought back to life.' Apart from the rarity of this meaning, it is not easy to think of the writer so employing it after using the word παγίδος, which is naturally followed by ζωγρεῖν in its ordinary sense of 'capture alive.'

If naturalness is a sound criterion of correctness, Dr. Scott would seem to offend against it by breaking the natural flow of the language with a halt after αὐτοῦ, Dr. Moffatt by neglecting the relation between παγίδος and ἐζωγρημένοι. Then, again, εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου θέλημα is not naturally linked with ἀνανήψωσιν, which needs no such completion and is better without it. Doubtless the phrase 'will of God' is more in line with Biblical usage. But the 'snare of the devil' prepares the reader for the 'will of the devil,' inasmuch as 'snare' implies the operation of 'will.' Furthermore, the introduction of the 'snare' metaphor calls for explication, which is quite fittingly given by the ἐζωγρημένοι clause, as understood by the translators of the Authorized Version.

Here the Revisers of 1881 have followed another interpretation, possible but surely improbable, which refers αὐτοῦ to the Lord's servant of v.^{24} and ἐκείνου to God. It is not surprising that some of them dissented from this view and secured the insertion of an alternative in the margin. The reference of αὐτοῦ to so distant a subject can hardly be accepted, though apparently commended to Bengel and others by suiting that interpretation of ἐζωγρημένοι, which links it with Lk 5^{10}, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν. In the Septuagint ζωγρεῖν is variously applied. In Jos 2^{13} 6^{25} it is applied to the preservation of Rahab and her household when other inhabitants of Jericho are destroyed; but in 2 Ch 25^{12} it is applied to the capture of prisoners who are straightway consigned to utter destruction. The common element is the taking alive, which may have a sinister purpose as well as a merciful one.

Interpreters may feel that the reference of ἐκείνου to God gives a happier end to a very impressive sentence packed with the finest Christian teaching. True: but the homilist is anxious to warn his readers of the formidable character of the opposition which confronts the Lord's servant in his labours for the furtherance of righteousness and truth.

I should like to add a translation (my own) of the whole sentence (2 Ti $2^{24\text{-}26}$):

'The Lord's servant must not fight, but be peaceable towards all men, apt to teach, patient of evil, gently schooling the adversely disposed; lest at any time God may grant them a change of mind to recognize what is true, and they may recover themselves out of the devil's snare—held captive by him, as they are, a living prey to *his* (sinister) will.'

James P. Wilson.

St. Quivox, Ayr.

Entre Nous.

The Life to Come.

It is one thing to believe in the life to come, another to form some conception of it. Our conception of it will depend very largely on our views of the relation of soul and body.

According to the Greek tradition, in its most typical form, the soul is an everlasting thing. It does not perish with the dissolution of its earthly tabernacle. Already, indeed, before its entrance into the body it possessed the quality of everlastingness. Here it tabernacles for a season, leading a dull prison-house kind of existence. But at death it escapes from the prison-house, and emerges once more upon the broad and glorious expanses of eternity. The body returns to the earth from which it came, and the soul or spirit is united once again to the Infinite and Eternal Substance of God.

Through Wordsworth's famous Ode, English readers have been made familiar with this notion of the everlasting nature of the soul, never born and never dying. He perpetuates for us the old Greek conception, which is also the Oriental conception, in poetic and transfigured form. Under the influence of Plato's doctrine of the soul as an eternal and indestructible thing, and more especially of his doctrine of reminiscence or recollection, he represents the soul at birth, which he describes as but a sleep and a forgetting, as coming fresh from God's imperial palace; so that the child is nearer than the man to the vision splendid. And it is apparently implied that after death the soul must reach again its home in God, beyond that immortal sea which brought us hither, where the mighty waters roll for evermore.

So far the old Greek and Oriental conception of the soul and its relation to the body. At the present day it is chiefly expounded in Hindu philosophy and among Western theosophers.

Turn now to the Christian tradition. In the Christian tradition the notion of the soul's pre-existence is virtually ignored, most people in the Western world regarding it as merely a haunting speculation. Christian thought rejects also the Greek and Oriental view of the future state, in which the soul, being part of the Divine Essence or Substance, is at death merged again in the Infinite, as the stream loses itself in the ocean. Such a view is regarded as subversive of the feeling and consciousness of moral responsibility: if there is no personal survival in the world to come, then it is difficult to think of this world as in any real sense a sphere of moral discipline and preparation.

What, then, does Christianity affirm as over against the Greek view? In the Christian tradition the effort is made to conserve the idea of personal survival. According to the Hebrew doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh, soul and body though dissolved at death shall yet meet again, and thus the complete or entire person be reconstituted.

But the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh, of the reassembling of the material particles of the body, presents difficulties of its own. St. Paul did not accept it, at every stage of his thought at least, and it was in view of St. Paul's teaching that in the English Prayer Book version of the Apostles' Creed the phrase, 'I believe . . . in the resurrection of the flesh,' was changed into the less materialistic phrase, 'I believe . . . in the resurrection of the body.' The notion that the soul and the body of flesh shall meet again must always have been a difficult notion for thoughtful people to maintain, and the advance of physical and chemical science has made it now almost unbelievable.

How does St. Paul conceive of the state of personal existence in the hereafter? In 1 Co 15 he draws a distinction between the natural body and the spiritual body, and affirms that in the resurrection of the dead it is not the natural but a spiritual body that is raised: 'It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body.'

In 2 Co 5 he appears to reaffirm this distinction in a more figurative way. Here on earth, as he says in effect, we dwell in a tabernacle, a tent, a building made of perishable stuff, liable to collapse at any moment; there in heaven we shall dwell in a building of God, immaterial, spiritual, eternal—in a glorious body, a spiritual not a natural body; fashioned by the Divine Artificer—as we might add—to be the organ or instrument of the Christlike soul. 'We know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.' William Fulton.

Glasgow.

Christianity and the Individual.

Professor Halford E. Luccock of Yale University has chosen a vital subject for his latest book, *Christianity and the Individual* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). Those who know Professor Luccock's previous books, and who look for fresh ideas put in a way essentially easy to follow, and lit up by the many illustrations with which his mind is stored, will find here all they expect.

Professor Luccock considers the forces which are running over the individual 'like a fleet of steam rollers,' crushing out personal values. And these are not only found in Totalitarian States. In democracies, economic forces, the tyranny of mass thinking, and other movements overrun personality. And so his object is to rethink the place of the individual—to consider what is the Christian contribution to the achievement of personality; in brief, what is the individual gospel. In considering this, Professor Luccock does not forget the Social Gospel.

This is a book for preachers, and while all is good, we have no hesitation in saying that the best is the last chapter, where Professor Luccock writes on preaching to personal needs. For he agrees with Dr. Coffin that preaching is 'truth through personality *to a person.*' Preaching is not broadcasting to the universe, but 'must be aimed at a definite receiving end' and the preacher must bring ideals into moving relationship with the machinery of everyday living. Here he uses the symbol of William James, 'The upper mill wheel above a lower one may be turning, but unless there is some sort of a peg joining the lower one to the upper, the motion of the upper wheel will not turn the lower one. The upper wheel may represent ideals, faiths, professions; the lower one, the practices of everyday life. Often there is little or no connexion between the two. There is need to drop down a peg from the upper to the lower wheel so that faiths and ideals may be brought into effective relation to the machinery of everyday experience. Preaching has much to do with "pegs."'

But he enters a caveat against 'practical' preaching, and reminds his readers of the passage in Canon C. E. Raven's autobiography in which he tells of his disappointment in schoolboy days over the preaching which left out any deeply religious challenge.

'One of the highest offices of friendship is expectation, the demand of faith and love, which holds a friend up to his utmost. Jesus never failed men in that high gift of friendship. The friendliest word He ever spoke was, "Take up your cross and follow me." It was a persistent friendship for the highest possibility in men.'

Preachers must disturb, or they will merit the words of Joseph Auslander:

We who were prophets and priest-men
For the Kings of the East and the East-men,
The bugles of God to the beast-men,
  His terrible seal on our brow—
Physicians of music and makers
Of language and law and the breakers
Of battle, strength-lifters, heart-shakers—
  We are nice poets now.

'Ye have heard it said.'

'Henri Bergson, in his *Two Sources of Morality and Religion*, whatever his book may lack as a completely satisfactory ethics or philosophy of religion, has put preachers deeply in his debt in his suggestive distinction between the morality of "obligation" and that of "aspiration." By the "morality of obligation" he means those moralities of customs and habits which are useful instruments for social cohesion for the family, the tribe, and the nation. It is a type of morality necessary if societies are to be kept stable and fixed. So much of the stress of organized religion has gone into the teaching of this kind of morality, often to being blind to any other variety. There is also, Bergson says, a morality which springs from intelligence as opposed to bundles of habit, a morality tinged often with scepticism toward much traditional moral "obligation." It is the morality which is not forced by obligation, but in which the vision of some ideal incarnate in some saint or moral hero "beckons the individual to some vital variation," some new expression of moral feeling. It will be readily seen that it is in this second type of morality that there is the largest and indeed the only hope for a Christian world. It is the kind of morality which lies close to the heart of Christian teaching, as put in Jesus' contrasts, "Ye have heard it said, . . . but I say unto you.'[1]

Truth.

Mr. Arnold Lunn contributes an article to the September number of *The Nineteenth Century*, in which he urges the eradicating of the 'greatest of all heresies, "It does not matter what a man believes so long as he behaves." '

'We have not repudiated Christianity in England,' he writes, 'but we treat it as irrelevant and unimportant. English education is based on the implicit premise that it is more important for a boy to know when Queen Anne died than for him to discover why Christ rose from the dead. We have accepted with uncritical faith the greatest of heresies, that it does not matter what a man believes so long as he behaves, and we are unmoved by the evidence which suggests that men cease to behave when they cease to believe. We are losing our respect for truth, but we forget that truth has its claims apart from the social consequences of truth. The events of the first Easter Sunday belong to history, and if it be important to know what happened at Waterloo, it is equally important to know what happened in a garden near Jerusalem on the first Easter Sunday, even if the social and ethical consequences of that happening were of no importance.

'Christianity is something more than a useful adjunct to "house spirit." A young friend of mine summed up his experience of public school religion. "At Eton," he said, "they told me that Christianity would help me to be good. I did not particularly want to be good, so I was not interested in Christianity. Some years later I discovered that Christianity was true, and from the fact of its truth certain inconvenient conclusions followed, among others that I ought to try to be good." '

Beauty.

'Walking, two mornings since,' writes Robert Nichols in *Time and Tide*, 'along a narrow damp alley, I looked up and saw some five or six sprays of a creeper with orange-red flowers silhouetted against the pure blue of the sky. "For those six sprays," I said to myself, "I would surrender man-made Venice entire." Pondering this discovery, I ask myself why man-made Venice should move me so little and those few hundred tiny leaves and twenty-one flowers so much. My answer is lame enough but, such as it is, I believe it to be made without self-deceit. "I feel as I do because there is a blessing in these flowers which either never was in these buildings or has departed from them." I do not quite know what I mean by blessing, but I know that life for me is becoming more and more impossible without the sense of it. To what this sense of blessing in these flowers is due, I cannot exactly say, but I fancy it has to do with an immediate perception that these flowers are the work of an artist of extraordinary spontaneity and apparently effortless and quite illimitable power.'

The Little Region of Palestine.

At the British Association meetings at Nottingham last month, Mr. H. G. Wells was president of the educational science section, and he had a number of provocative and thoroughly Wellsian things to say, especially on the teaching of history. 'And I have to suggest another exclusion. We are telling our young people about the real past, the majestic expansion of terrestrial events. In these events the little region of Palestine is no more than a part of the highway between Egypt and Mesopotamia. Is there any real reason nowadays for exaggerating its importance in the past? Nothing began there, nothing was worked out there. All the historical part of the Bible abounds in wild exaggeration of the importance of this little strip of land.

'Is it not time that we recognized the extreme insignificance of the events recorded in Kings and Chronicles, and ceased to throw the historical imagination of our young people out of perspective by an over-emphasized magnification of the history of Judea? Look at our time-table and what we have to teach. If we give history four-tenths of all the time we have for imparting knowledge, that still gives us at most something a little short of four hundred hours altogether. Even if we think it desirable to perplex another generation with the myths of the Creation, the Flood, the Chosen People, and so forth, we haven't got the time for it—any more than we have the time for the really quite unedifying records of all the Kings and Queens of England and their claims on this and that. No reason why much of that stuff should not be picked up in private reading—by those who like that sort of thing.'

---

[1] H. E. Luccock, *Christianity and the Individual*, 197.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works,
and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street,
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings
Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Much is written in our time about religious experience, and great stress is laid upon its objective reality, its validity, and the value of its evidence in support of man's faith in God.

This is a healthy reaction from the rationalistic idea that God is simply an object of philosophic study and the Christian faith a complex of doctrines to be drawn out by processes of cold logic.

Yet it will be found that religious experience is very vaguely conceived, so that it is not always easy to grasp what is to be understood by it and what its evidence amounts to. In particular it seems often to be identified pre-eminently with certain rare types of intense emotion and exalted feeling characteristic of those who are classed as mystics.

Certain objections to this arise at once in the mind of the ordinary man. He is conscious for one thing that though a sincere Christian he enjoys no ecstatic moods, he is not visited by mystic feelings or thrills in his soul which convince him of the immediate presence of God. He may have earnestly sought such experiences, may have tried in times of special religious aspiration to work up such feelings in his soul, and having failed, may have reproached himself for his deadness of heart. On the other hand, he may have learned from the writings of the mystics that the heights of their religious exaltation have often been followed by reactions when they were plunged into the depth of spiritual misery and even despair. So he may conclude that it is better to abjure the heights and plod along the level road of duty without the heavenly thrills and exquisite agonies of the mystic soul. None the less he would fain have some assurance that his faith is not vain.

Then there is always the difficulty of how to interpret the experience. Just as a sick man has pains and symptoms which he can accurately describe yet needs a medical practitioner to interpret them, so is it with religious experience. The man who has the experience is not necessarily the correct or the best interpreter of the experience. William James in his 'Varieties of Religious Experience' gives the story of how a free-thinking French Jew was converted to Roman Catholicism by what he took for a vision of the Virgin Mary. 'Oh, indeed, it was She!' he exclaimed, 'It was indeed She!' One may be sure that if he had been living in a Protestant environment his interpretation of his experience would have been different.

The fluctuations of human feeling are so notorious and our spiritual experiences are so varied and perplexing that warnings have to be given by wise religious teachers not to trust in changeful feelings but in the unchanging Word of God. This, however, at once raises the question of how the Word of God is to be recognized as such. The answer which Robertson Smith gave to this question was in harmony with Reformation teaching. 'This record I know to be true by the witness of His Spirit in my heart, whereby I am assured that none other than God Himself is able to speak such words to my soul.' That, of course, involves a most definite religious experience.

It is impossible, in short, to put aside religious experience, and the testimony of experience must always have weight. When the man born blind can say, 'One thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see,' no argument to the contrary is of any avail. And men do have religious experiences of that sort. They can testify that for them life is a new thing, and the change must be accounted for. When Müller of Bristol found the daily wants of his great orphanage supplied with the most minute and unfailing accuracy through a long course of years an irresistible impression was made on his mind, and on other minds, that a loving heavenly Father was caring for His children in response to their faith and prayer. Many plain Christian folk, without ecstasies and tumults of feeling, have had their faith sustained by experiences of that sort.

The subject of religious experience, then, is of great interest and importance, and it deserves to be studied with the utmost care. A very helpful book in this connexion is *The Validity of Religious Experience*, by the Rev. F. E. ENGLAND, Ph.D., M.A., B.D. (Nicholson & Watson; 8s. 6d. net). One of the excellences of this book is that it treats religious experience psychologically as a genuine branch of human experience whose validity is to be tested in the usual way. 'No subject of human investigation within can long remain the shelter of a sacred enclosure, screened from the scrutiny of logical analysis. Logic does not supply the material of religious experience, but logic determines its validity or shatters its pretensions. Not that our thinking must be tried by static and barren moulds of so-called "formal logic," but rather that our thinking must accord with certain fundamental principles without which knowledge itself would be impossible.'

The writer carries through a long and acute analysis of the genesis and content of religious experience. He finds that self-consciousness, the power of self-determination, and the sense of moral obligation carry with them certain important implications. 'Progress in personal development depends upon the person's response to a call from outside and above him. Personality lives and grows as it becomes more and more familiar with an order of reality which is gradually disclosed to us in factual situations. . . . We do not invent moral values, we discover them at the heart of our experience. They become articulate in times of moral stress. Whether we conceive of a World of Forms seeking continual ingression in the phenomenal world, or of an Unmoved Mover drawing individuals ever onward towards himself as a lover draws the beloved, the experience of moral individuals is left inexplicable save as it be regarded as the response of the human creature to the challenge of a higher order.'

We conclude with Von Hügel that no account of the religious consciousness will be more than a ludicrous caricature unless it recognizes that from the first, God, the abiding reality on which our mutable being depends, is regarded as *given*, and that the piquancy of the religious life depends precisely on this givenness. Freud followed by many modern psychologists has asserted that religious experience is based on illusion, that the idea of God is a projection of the human mind born out of the stress of man's conflict with Nature and his sense of impotence. But, as against this, one is impelled to ask, what was it that stimulated man to embark upon the apparently hopeless task of shaping his conduct in accordance with standards flagrantly opposed to his natural impulses? 'Let it be granted that man's thought about the spiritual order follows the line of his deepest needs; granted that a man's religious experience is born of a sense of dependence; granted that the religious conceptions held by many people (especially by the sort of people described in Freud's case-histories) are deeply dyed with superstition and infantile fantasy; these facts have little bearing on the question of the objective validity of the religious conception of God.'

The question of objectivity is wrongly approached if we start out to consider whether the idea of God has any sort of counterpart in reality. 'The real problem is not whether this or that conception of God may be admitted to have objective validity, but what concept of God, of the Unconditioned, of the Absolute, of Reality as a whole, of the Supreme Unity or the Supreme Ground of Reality, or whatever other name be used, we are compelled to form if we are to do full justice to all the facts of experience so far as those facts have been discriminated by mortals.' In attempting the solution of this problem we must avoid the fallacy that the rational is the real, in the sense that reality can be deduced with mathematical certainty from our laws of thought. We must be content with that degree of probability which we find sufficient for our guidance in the practical affairs of life. 'How should we explain the emergence of personality with its qualities of self-consciousness, self-determination, knowledge, valuation, and love were it not that these qualities, together with all qualities yet to be actualized in the finite world, subsisted at the heart of reality as a whole?'

In short, our clue to the nature of God must be anthropic, if not anthropomorphic. When we have a sense of moral obligation, of loyalty to inviolate goodness, of adoration in presence of the supremely holy, we are conscious of values outside and beyond ourselves. It is not mere piety which compels us to conceive of the source of these values as an existent Being. For the quality of holiness cannot be divorced from a Holy Being; goodness is an abstraction apart from some personal Embodiment; love and adorableness, if they belong to reality at all, must belong to a Holy Lover. 'Whatever may be the notion to which we are finally driven, we can hardly escape the conviction that behind all finite things and events there is a creative spirit, working ceaselessly with a material which is at once refractory and difficult and yet subject to ultimate control. . . . But the greatest wonder of God's activity is not His presence in the *cursus ordinarius* of Nature but His presence at the heart of human life, converting a spectacle of irremediable suffering into a tragedy in which new and loftier values come to light. When men called Jesus the Son of God they meant that in Him God was visiting and redeeming His people. They saw the age-long redemptive activity of God made personal in Christ. In the way Christ met the ugly passions of men, they got a glimpse of the patience and holy love of God. And in the face of the crucified Christ men saw the primal creative appetition concretely and sublimely expressed.'

In the 'Spectator' of September 24th, a letter, in which the writer was commenting on Mr. H. G. Wells's utterances about education, contained the following interesting passage: 'After hearing the views of four educational experts from four different nations, Mr. Wells observed very truly that there was no agreement between them on the vital question, What is the Community? In making this remark Mr. Wells exposed one of the major tragedies of our time, and one of the chief causes of our spiritual, intellectual, and moral confusion. . . . Every social and religious and educational doctrine depends finally upon some conception of the Community, which the doctrine in question seeks to establish or consolidate; but what concord can be found between the leading exponents of such doctrines to-day?'

This is exactly the point of *The Beloved Community*, by Canon Roger Lloyd of Winchester (Nisbet; 7s. 6d. net). There has always been a tension between the individual and the community, says Canon Lloyd. This tension is the real stuff of which History is made. There is something in man which requires both self-expression and discipline, 'multitude and solitude.' And they war against each other. You find this in every kind of society, from a trade union to an empire. And the success of a society in surviving depends on its ability to reconcile the two sides, the individualism that will take its own way, and the social group that limits and disciplines this waywardness. This effort has been made from time immemorial. It is being made to-day by systems that get down on one side of the fence or the other.

You can only get rid of the tension by some such one-sided process. The Totalitarian State does so by suppressing the individual. Anarchism does so by negating the community. All utopias do so by a dream condition that avoids reality. This is true, for example, of the conventional picture of heaven, where all is smooth and monotonous just because the tension has been abolished. But you cannot abolish this strain in human experience, because it is inevitable and necessary. It is the condition of progress. To try to suppress it is to ask man to cease to be human. The state of tension is a principle of creativeness, and necessary for growth. The interests of the individual and the community have always clashed, and will never cease to clash.

The real problem is to make the tension 'creative and fruitful.' In other words, it is to achieve an adjustment between the needs of the individual and the needs of the society, between the individual's self-expression and the rights and function of the community. What principle can we find that will do justice to both sides? Canon Lloyd finds this principle in religion. It is only when the individual and the community are set within the framework of spiritual reality that they are unified and the tension between them, while it is not destroyed, is made creative of life and fruitful in service. Personal liberty and corporate loyalty are equalized and reconciled in the one state of society in which the dream of such a reconciliation has been realized, the Christian Church.

Canon Lloyd insists on this point with repeated emphasis. We are in the very midst of a world confusion in which attempts are being made to solve the eternal problem, *the* problem of our day in particular, of the relation of personality to society. Democracy, Communism, Authoritarianism are all efforts to find a way of reconciliation. But they all fail, for one thing, because they are temporal and materialistic. The one possible solution is to be found on two conditions. One is a spiritual interpretation of life. Life in and under God. And further, secondly, it is found only in a context of eternal life. Canon Lloyd insists on this latter point. 'The supreme need of all sociology is the constant recollection of the fact of eternal life.' And if this seems a trifle distant and impractical, Miss Underhill, commenting on it, in an article in 'Time and Tide,' reminds us that 'the wider the horizon within which we are able to place any observed series, the greater our chance of escaping merely utilitarian or self-interested solutions and approximating to the truth.'

At any rate, it is in a spiritual society that Canon Lloyd finds the only real solution of the great problem of our day. And for confirmation he directs us to the Bible. 'The Bible has more light to shed on the problem we are considering than has any other book in the world.' The problem is insoluble apart from religion, because the self-sacrifice and devotion and discipline which are essential to a reconciliation can be secured only by religion, only in 'an experience which has God at its heart.' The fact of God and His relevance both to the community and to the individual are the very characteristics of a community which did rule its life by divine standards, that of ancient Israel and of the New Israel, the Christian Church.

For the Jew the community was life, *and* the individual was profoundly important and significant. Both achievements were his, and to the fact that he maintained them on a fruitful level of tension is to be traced the supreme contribution to history and civilization which the Jews made. And this was so because the Jews were supreme theocrats. No doubt it was community that was specially emphasized in Israel. While the Old Testament is a story of heroes and saints, their significance lay in the fact that all they did was done for Israel. To the Old Testament Jew the nation was the supreme expression of the very being of God. God is incarnate in it. His glory is expressed in it. Everything done is done to promote the welfare of the nation. The great figures in the Old Testament are not so much persons as Jews. They were parts of the community. And the interventions of God were interventions within the community rather than separate inspirations of the leaders.

When we step into the New Testament the emphasis is changed. The individual comes to the front. In the Old Testament, for the most part, the individual is only significant as part of the community. Jesus stresses the worth of the individual soul in its own right. This is so well known it does not need to be enlarged on. But it ought to be noted that this stress on the individual in the teaching of Jesus was due to two things—His belief in personal immortality, and His vision of the service which the redeemed individual could render to the community. But while Jesus emphasized the worth of the individual He did not lose sight of the community. What He did was to universalize it. In the Parable of the Good Samaritan community is shown to rest on acts of kindness which leap over all the artificial barriers that men erect between themselves. And at the Well in conversation with the Samaritan woman He expressed a similar view in regard to worship.

There can be no doubt that Jesus had in view a community, and that in this new fellowship the individual and the community would each have its function. There would never be an absence of tension, because individual and community would each have its rights. Neither factor would be suppressed. But the individual would find his happiness and his welfare and peace in the service of the community. Life and opportunity and blessing would come to him through the community, and the tension that must always exist between the two would be made creative of good and fruitful of service to the world by the fact that both were rooted in God, and the goal of both was the perfect fulfilment of His will in a sphere that is not bounded by time or space but is a realm of eternal life. And so there never will be a solution to the problem that faces us to-day, as it has faced other times, until we base all upon a spiritual interpretation of life, and especially upon a context which is not only spiritual but eternal.

Our wonder grows as to how Dr. Temple finds the mere time to accomplish what he does. The care of the churches in his large and important Diocese and the superintendence of his Province, his service on so many committees and at so many conferences, the number of public engagements fulfilled, and—what directly concerns us—the production of so many books—how is it done? Well, it is done, and it is well done.

From the Archbishop's pen we welcome another of those smaller books which are finding and edifying that large, not academic, but earnest, public for which they are designed. The most recent is *Basic Convictions* (Hamish Hamilton; 2s. 6d. net). It consists of four short but pregnant chapters on the Reality of God and the Obligation of Worship; the Revelation of God in Jesus Christ; the Cross of Christ and the Need of the World; and the Divine Constraint of Christian Missions—basic topics indeed.

We may serve our readers most profitably if we follow Dr. Temple in just one subject. While all his topics are vital and each is illumined by his treatment, we select that which he handles in the latter portion of his first chapter—Prayer. That, of course, is itself a very big subject, the full treatment of which would take a volume many times the size of this little book. Yet in a few pages Dr. Temple has contrived to set forth several points about prayer some or all of which even people who do pray too frequently forget. And because they forget those things they are not seldom sorely perplexed.

Why should we pray at all? Because we are convinced that God is real—the God and Father whom Christ revealed. One who does not pray does not believe that God is real. Further, we are convinced that we ourselves are poor, needy, and sinful. If we were perfect there would not be the same necessity to pray; but we are far from perfect, and so if we know of God and what kind of God He is, and if we know ourselves, we pray.

But is it of any use to pray? What difference does praying make? Every minister has been confronted with that question, and it is not always easy to answer. Fortunately modern science has considerably relaxed its conception of natural law.

It no longer condemns us to a universe where all things follow in an unmodifiable series of iron necessity. We mean nowadays by the uniformity of Nature no more than regularity, some would say average regularity, of happenings. And in Dr. TEMPLE's words, 'while God behaves regularly at nearly all times, this is not because He is bound so to do, but because it is conducive to His purpose so to do. And if that be true, then, when the occasion is sufficient, He can and will do something contrary to the ordinary course of nature.'

Further, we do not pray in order 'to persuade God to do what He was not going to do before.' 'We do not try to change His mind: that would be an enterprise blasphemous in the attempt and calamitous in the accomplishment.' Prayer for any particular good must always have at the back of it the basal prayer, 'Thy will be done,' 'nevertheless not as I will, but as Thou wilt.'

Forgetfulness of this induces the too often artificial and unreal perplexity as to unanswered prayer. Who has never been perplexed by it? The mother has cried to God for the life of her child, yet the child was taken. Our fairest dreams of good have failed often enough, despite our prayers. We must always remember that 'what we are aiming at in prayer is not changing God's mind but changing our own minds, putting ourselves into such true fellowship with God (which means obedience to Him) that what is truly blessing in its own nature may be effectually a blessing to us.'

Every true prayer, says Dr. TEMPLE, is granted in some form or other. But it is often granted in a form which we do not quite desire. Here he makes a very striking point. If our prayer is for increase in some grace of character, then almost inevitably the answer will consist in giving us fresh and probably harder opportunities for the practice of the desired virtue, 'as in the case of the lady who prayed for patience only to have her prayer answered by being provided with an ill-tempered cook.' We cannot have patience except in the exercise of it; and therefore 'to pray for patience is to ask in effect that your life may be for a little while rather specially irritating.' Which is just the Archbishop's way of saying that among God's manifold mercies is the mercy which denies our own specific request and substitutes something we did not desire, but proves in our experience to be a far, far better thing. 'The truly effective prayer is that offered by the man who does not primarily care about the difference he makes, but primarily cares about the glory of God.' But we are so constantly tempted to regard prayer as a means of getting our own will done.

Another good point is this. 'The fact that God wants you to attempt something is no ground whatever for supposing that He wants you to succeed at it.' At first this sounds a hard saying, but if we think it over, we shall find that not only is it true, but that there is comfort in it. We are depressed so often at the seeming fruitlessness of our best efforts. What minister has not been flung into the depths of despondency by the lack of visible result? He seems to himself to be beating the air, he wonders if he has not mistaken his vocation. He is wrong in that despondency. God sent him into the vineyard but gave him no guarantee of a soul per sermon, or even a soul a year. 'I may be going to carry out His purpose precisely through my failure, the way I bear it, and the lessons that men learn from it.'

Primitive prayer according to the best authorities was a cry for succour in some specific strait. What is wrong about much of our praying is that we have not outgrown the primitive. Our prayers are overmuch a list of petitions for ourselves or others. Certainly we have authority—the highest—for asking for definite boons, but we should remember on the same highest authority that our Heavenly Father knoweth what we have need of. So Dr. TEMPLE's last point is that the very heart of prayer is not petition but adoration. 'The most effective thing that the Church of Christ can do in the world, and the most effective thing that any individual Christian can do, is to lift up his heart in adoration to God.' We may interject that one great defect of free public prayer is its lack of this element of adoration. We hope that this point of Dr. TEMPLE's will be pondered. 'As we become forgetful of ourselves and entirely filled with His glory—the glory of His righteousness and love, we become transformed into His image from glory to glory; and because we are more like Him, we shall live more like Him; because we live more like Him, we shall do something that is far more truly His will than what we might have planned out for ourselves in an eager and perhaps impatient generosity. Adoration—the utter giving of the self to God that He might fill it, a total forgetfulness of self in the presence of God that God may be all in all—that is the heart of worship.'

Aramaic Gospel-Sources and Form-Criticism.

By Professor W. R. Taylor, Ph.D., D.D., University of Toronto.

The translation of the Four Gospels published in 1933 by Professor C. C. Torrey and his recent work, *Our Translated Gospels* (1936), have elicited widely differing opinions with reference to the validity of his main thesis. The views of recent students of the problem may be said to fall into four classes. There is first that of Professor Torrey himself, as it is stated in the introduction to his work, 'the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and John were composed in Aramaic on the basis of popular documents widespread in Palestine, and they were by others translated into Greek without intended change; also, Luke employed only Semitic sources, assembling them into an especially complete Gospel, which he himself translated.' Secondly, there is the 'minimal hypothesis,' as Professor T. W. Manson styles it,[1] 'Most scholars would now agree that the authentic pieces of the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels and the earliest stories about Jesus were originally formulated in Aramaic whether or not they ever took written shape in that language.' Obviously this view gives considerable latitude to those who hold it, since there can be wide differences of opinion as to what material is authentic and early. But there is a third view which is perhaps more minimal than Professor Manson anticipated. It is stated by Professor D. W. Riddle,[2] 'When Dr. Torrey's Aramaic gospels are studied in the light of the history of gospel research, it is seen that there is little in his theory that is new. The inexorable logic of history plainly points to the fate of the earlier theories which were so closely similar. It is highly probable that Dr. Torrey's Aramaic gospels will go the way of Eichhorn's and Marshall's, the way of all those theories which have depended upon Semitic documents to solve the Synoptic problem.' In Professor Riddle's article there seems to be a certain confusion of Professor Torrey's theory of the Aramaic sources of the Gospels with his theory of their growth and formation, two interests which ought to be kept distinct. Finally, there are scholars, such as Professor Manson,[3] Professor Karl Kundsin,[4] and Professor E. Littmann,[5] who admit evidences of the existence of one or more Aramaic documents behind the Gospels. Professor Manson's conclusions are specific. 'The only case in which one can feel fairly confident that a written Aramaic source lies behind the Gospels is that of the document Q. I think it very probable that such an Aramaic document existed, and that it is the writing referred to in the tradition handed down by Papias. It is also, I think, probable that much of the matter peculiar to Matthew is derived from an Aramaic document or documents. It is at least possible that an Aramaic document is one of the sources of the Fourth Gospel. Mark and the matter peculiar to Luke seem to me to depend on oral tradition rather than written Aramaic sources, though a great part of this oral tradition was doubtless Palestinian and, in the first instance, Aramaic.' Dalman in his studies proceeds cautiously with the basal assumption that the words of Jesus were originally in Aramaic. But, as he establishes no criteria by which we can distinguish between the genuine words of Jesus and those that are of secondary origin, his investigations are practically little different from those which assume the existence of a Semitic source behind the Synoptic Gospels.

In general, the reasons which in recent years influenced scholars to assume the dependence of the Synoptic Gospels and even that of the Fourth Gospel on Aramaic sources, have been set forth by Wellhausen in his *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* (1905), pp. 14–43. Later investigations and discoveries may have modified some of the details of Wellhausen's argument, but for the most part it defines those things which a student acquainted with Greek and Semitic idioms notes on reading the Gospels. In short, the language in which they are written appears to be a Semitized Greek. The papyri evidences have served to confirm such a conclusion. No document has been found that proves the existence of a jargon which might account for the characteristic features of the language of these books. 4 Maccabees, which belongs to the century in which the Gospels appeared, indicates that what is described as 'truly Greek' was used and understood in Jewish circles. Like the Greek of the

---

[1] The Expository Times, xlvii. 7.

[2] *Journal of Biblical Literature*, liv. 138.

[3] The Expository Times, xlvii. 7.

Das Urchristentum (1929), p. 12.

Z.N.W. xxxiv. 20–34.

LXX, the Greek of the Gospels is written in an idiom which stands apart from that employed in either literary or popular κοινή.[1]

None knew better than Wellhausen the difficulties that beset the scholar who undertakes to reproduce the Aramaic *Urtext*. The first of them is the lack of Palestinian Aramaic documents of the first century A.D. and the resultant ignorance of the exact idiom of the period. This defect of literary material, however, cannot be cited as invalidating the substance of the theory. It is rather late in the day to say that the scantiness of the remains of this Aramaic indicates that however large the public for spoken Aramaic, 'it was not a public which called forth an extensive *written* product.'[2] It is common knowledge that Josephus issued the first draft of his book, the *History of the Jewish War*, in Aramaic for a public which included not only Jews at home, but Parthians, Babylonians, the most remote tribes of Arabia, his countrymen beyond the Euphrates and the inhabitants of Adiabene.[3] As Thackeray states,[4] Josephus was in this matter commissioned by the Romans to write such a history for purposes of propaganda, that is, with a view to discouraging unrest and revolt in Western Asia. Evidently at that time there was a large public for written Aramaic.[5] The survival of the literature of an age or even of a country is often a matter of accident. For example, if we learn of the Seleucids chiefly through the scanty evidences that coins afford and of the Ptolemies through a wealth of *papyri*-remains, we cannot conclude that the Seleucid kingdom had no public for literature. In fact, such caprices of fortune may lead to a distorted view of the historical conditions in such matters. It was to guard against such misconceptions of the place of Aramaic in Palestine in the first century that Dalman in the second edition of *Die Worte Jesu* (1930), pp. 1–10, reviews the evidences presented earlier in his *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch* (1905). These evidences might have been supplemented by those indirect ones offered by the Nabatæan inscriptions of the first century A.D. and by the structural features of Aramaic that, wherever in the East its remains emerge, exhibit the marks of literary use and tradition. We can posit too that an Aramaic-speaking public normally would call forth a written product.[6]

Nor is there much cogency in the argument that because theories of Semitic gospels or gospel sources have in the course of more than one hundred years failed to present an incontrovertible case, the problems that occasioned them must be dismissed as illusory. Such theories were at a disadvantage not only by reason of the prejudices born of the age-long conviction that the Gospels in Greek were primary documents, but also through the lack of philological knowledge equal to the task involved.[7] But the amœboid character of Synoptic theories which have won more general acceptance warns us that the last word on Gospel-origins has not been said, and the persistence with which theories of Semitic sources reappear suggests that the facts which bring them into being have not been satisfactorily integrated into the current orthodox theories.

Nor does it seem more cogent to refer Aramaic elements in the Gospels to the influence of spoken Aramaic in the form of Christian preaching on the early records. If the Aramaic elements consisted only of social background, atmosphere, cult-terminology, and related matters such a position might be tenable. But, as things are, it fails to take account of the literary problems presented in the text of the Gospels. Among these may be noted (*a*) differences in parallel synoptic traditions due to a misunderstanding or corruption of a written source which we are warranted in believing to be Aramaic—*e.g.* Mt 23[26] preserves correctly the meaning of Lk 11[41] where an original *'abedu ṣaddīqā* ('make right') was mistaken for *'abedu ṣedāqā* or *ṣidqā* ('give alms'),[8]—(*b*) obscure elements in the Synoptic tradition which become intelligible through the assumption of an Aramaic source—*e.g.* Mk 7[3] the difficult πυγμῇ is the result of the confusion of the Aramaic *ligmar* ('at all') with *ligmod* (=πυγμῇ),[9] so that the original source read 'they do not eat at all unless,' etc.: Lk 11[48] where the awkward lack of an object after οἰκοδομεῖτε is to be explained as due to a confusion of *benīn* ('children') with *bānēn* ('build'), *i.e.* 'they killed them and you are their children'—(*c*) strange idioms, such as the arrangement of words in an order foreign to Greek with consequent confusion in the sense—for example, Mt 5^{37} the Aramaic word-order is difficult in Greek; a better rendering is given in Ja 5^{12}. The translation of the verse is 'Let your word "yes" be yes and your "no" be no; whatever goes beyond this is of the evil one'[1]—(*d*) the puzzling use of particles and cases—*e.g.* the preposition *εἰς* to introduce a direct object, *ἔβαλον εἰς τὰ δῶρα* (Lk 21^{4}); the dative case of a direct object, *Ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δανείς* (Mt 21^{9}). Both instances, however, are intelligible as Aramaic constructions with the preposition לְ. In Mk 9^{10} the interrogative particle translated traditionally, and even by Torrey, as 'what' is, as the context indicates, to be turned as 'how' or 'after what manner,' a common value of the Hebrew מָה and the Aramaic מָא as we see in Nu 23^{8} (LXX) where *τί ἀράσωμαι* = מָה אֶקֹּב ('how shall I curse'). Another instructive example is supplied by the text of the Golden Rule, Mt 7^{12} *πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἐὰν θέλητε* . . ., Lk 6^{31} *καὶ καθὼς θέλετε* . . . In the Matthæan text *πάντα* is probably not to be explained as an example of Matthew's introduction of *πᾶς* in order to heighten his effects, as Professor Manson believes,[2] but rather as a too literal translation of the כָּל in the Aramaic (די) כָּל־קֳבֵיל. In LXX כָּל־קֳבֵיל is translated *καθότι* (Dn 2^{8}), *καθώς* (Dn 2^{40} 6^{10}), *καθάπερ* (Dn $2^{10.\,41}$). Matthew and Luke therefore have a common text before them, but exhibit differences in skill in the rendition of it. Such citations are sufficient to indicate that in the Greek text of the Synoptic Gospels there are certain problems for which the assumption of an Aramaic *Urtext* affords a reasonable solution.

---

[1] Cf. H. St. J. Thackeray, *Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek* (1909), pp. 26 f.; C. C. Torrey, *The Four Gospels* (1933), p. 249.

[2] *Journal of Biblical Literature*, liv. 136.

[3] *Bellum Judaicum*, i. 6.

[4] Thackeray, *Josephus* (1929), p. 27.

[5] Radermacher, *Neutestamentliche Grammatik* (1925), p. 17.

[6] *Journal of Biblical Literature*, liv. 136.

[7] Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 49 f.

[8] Torrey, *op. cit.* 310; see also Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, 372.

[9] Torrey, *op. cit.* 300.

One might pass beyond such textual phenomena where the argument seems to be irrefutable, and consider certain instances where the evidences, if not at once so decisive, cumulatively tend to establish the theory. For example, it is probable that Professor Torrey's emendation of 'in that day' (Lk 10^{12}) by 'in the day of judgement' correctly assumes a mistaken reading of *b'yōm dīnā* as *b'yōmā denā*. The use of the numeral חַד, 'one,' followed by another numeral expresses in Aramaic a multiplicative (cf. Dn 3^{19}, חַד שִׁבְעָה); in Mk $4^{8.\,20}$, therefore, the difficult *εἰς* and *ἐν* about which the textual evidences are uncertain should read *εἷς* and *ἕν*. The syntax of certain relative clauses exhibits the Semitic idiom of the redundant antecedent incorporated into the clause, or, in other words, of the retrospective pronoun familiar to students of Hebrew Grammar, *e.g.* Mk 7^{25} *ἧς εἶχε τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς* . . ., Mk 13^{19} *οἷα . . . τοιαύτη*. Of such constructions even Moulton[3] says: 'The N.T. examples are all from places where Aramaic sources are certainly suspected.' The use of the genitive absolute when in fact the noun or pronoun is not properly absolute and the particle might have agreed with the word in question is more common apparently in the New Testament than in the papyri.[4] One can scarcely escape the recognition of the idiom in *ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐνθυμηθέντος . . . ἐφάνη αὐτῷ* (Mt 1^{20}).[5] To satisfy those who contend that support for the Aramaisms of the Gospels should be found in Daniel one may compare the frequent use in Daniel of אֱדַיִן to introduce a new moment in a narrative with the similar use of *τότε, ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ* and *εὐθύς* (= בֵּאדַיִן) in the Gospel-narrative. The common Semitic practice of putting a compound subject in *casus pendens* is illustrated in Mt 6^{3}, Mk 12^{40}; cf. 2 Ch 7^{21} (LXX). The fact that such constructions and circumlocutions as we have been citing are idiomatic in Aramaic weakens considerably the force of parallels that occur sporadically in Greek poetry or prose.[6]

The general case that may be presented for the Aramaic origin of the Gospels ought not to be under-rated because of certain arguments that have been advanced against it. For instance, the difficulty of making assured *retroversions* does not modify in any fundamental respect the significance for the theory of the textual phenomena out of which it arises. It is generally accepted that 1 Maccabees is a translation of a Hebrew text, but the great diversity that 'retroversions' might show has never weighed against the conclusion which appears obvious to students of Hebrew. In Old Testament criticism with both the LXX and the Hebrew text before us, the problem of *retroversions* with which we are regularly confronted emerges without prejudice to the relation between the two texts.

Nor is the deficiency of extant Palestinian Aramaic literature contemporary with the Gospels an insuperable barrier to some secure judgments on the relation of the Gospels to Aramaic sources. The Aramaic language had developed before the time of Jesus certain characteristics which it retained quite tenaciously throughout its long history and its extensive domain. As other languages, it is marked by its own genius or soul. Hence its idiom is easily recognized whenever fragments of its literature come to light, and there is no ground for doubting that it can be detected in translation-works which do not conform completely to another idiom. But such a statement does not imply that more is to be expected in the reproduction of the original Aramaic form of the Gospels than, for example, in the reproduction of a lost Hebrew text from a Greek translation. Even if students were satisfied that the Greek text of Ecclesiasticus was a translation-work, the discovery of the Hebrew text furnished them with something new and beyond their power to anticipate correctly. The latter fact, however, did not impair their earlier assumption. It will be apparent, then, that the faithful identification of the Aramaic antecedents of the text of the Gospels must often wait on fuller knowledge of the local or dialectal usages in the first century in Palestine.

---

[1] Cf. Dalman, *op. cit.* 186, 352.

[2] THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xlvii. 8.

[3] J. H. Moulton, *Grammar of New Testament Greek* (1906), p. 95.

[4] A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (1914), p. 514.

[5] Cf. Mt 18^{25}, Mk 5^{21} 10^{17} 11^{27} $13^{1.\,3.\,11.\,13}$.

[6] Radermacher, *op. cit.* 21; cf. Wellhausen, *op. cit.* 35.

Two phases of the problem need at this time some special attention, (*a*) whether the evidences of Aramaic can be found beyond the limits of Q which a growing number of students concede to be a translation, and (*b*) what relation does the presence or absence of such evidences bear to the '*Sitz im Leben*' problems of Form-criticism. These questions can be examined together since certain texts have reference to both. Since Lk $13^{1-5.\ 6-9.\ 31-33}$ is not a portion of Q and is illustrative of three types of *apophthegmata* which the *Formgeschichtlicher* recognize, it can serve as a suitable section for examination. Lk 13^{1-5} seems in form to accord with Bultmann's description of the Greek apophthegm,[1] and might on this ground be viewed as a product of an Hellenistic environment and therefore of a relatively late date. Bultmann, however, because of its subject-matter seems to regard it as Palestinian in origin.[2] At any rate, according to Klostermann,[3] it is not to be included among the genuine *logia*, and reflects the legend-making tendencies of the Early Church. But early or late, Hellenistic or Palestinian, this text exhibits the same marks of Aramaic origin which have been noted in passages from Q. The Lucan ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ καιρῷ renders בַּהּ שַׁעְתָּא (cf. Dn $3^{6.\ 15}$ 4^{30} 5^{5}). In addition to the use of the retrospective pronoun (αὐτῶν v.[1], αὐτούς v.[4]), the nominative absolute (ἐκεῖνοι v.[4]), and the idiomatic ἀποκριθείς εἶπεν (cf. עֲנֵה וְאָמַר, Dn $2^{5.\ 8.\ 27}$), there is the use of πάντας in the sense not uncommon to כֹּל of 'the rest,' *i.e.* παρὰ πάντας τοὺς Γαλιλαίους = 'more than *the rest* of the Galilæans.' In Lk 13^{6-9} there are at least three characteristic Aramaic idioms, (*a*) ἰδοὺ τρία ἔτη ἀφ' οὗ (v.[7]), *i.e.* אֲרוּ שְׁנִין תְּלָת מִן־דִּי = 'since for three years now,' the particle מִן־דִּי being, as the context suggests, causal rather than temporal;[4] (*b*) the suppression of the apodosis in v.[9], 'zwar auch griechisch—aber im Semitischen regelmässig'[5] (cf. Dn 3^{15}); (*c*) εἰς τὸ μέλλον which, as Torrey has noted, renders לְהַלְאָה = 'thenceforth,' the לְ having a value here similar to that in לְקֳבֵל and such forms. In Lk 13^{31-33} there is not only the phrase ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, to which we have already referred, but the obscurity in the sense of vv.[32. 33] disappears only when (*a*) τελειοῦμαι is recognized as an error due to a translator's confusion of מְשַׁלַּם, *i.e.* about to be perfected, and מַשְׁלַם, *i.e.* about to be delivered up or arrested, and (*b*) after αὔριον (v.[33]) there is read ποιῆσαι (= מֶעְבַּד),[6] which had been omitted in the Aramaic text because of its resemblance to מֶעְבַּר (= πορεύεσθαι). Such evidences indicate that the influences of Aramaic are to be traced clearly in material outside of Q and also in traditions that according to the current canons of criticism cannot be early.[7]

Bultmann's statement that it is improbable that Lk $2^{31\text{ff.}}$ and the other infancy narratives took form in a Palestinian community, but that their formation occurred in a more advanced stage of Christianity than that in Palestine[8] is much too sweeping. Paul Humbert—in a recent study of Biblical annunciations[9]—has easily demonstrated that they are all of one type (cf. Jg $13^{3\text{ff.}}$ 13^{7}, Gn $16^{11\text{ff.}}$, Is $7^{14\text{ff.}}$, Lk $1^{31\text{ff.}}$), and the *Sitz im Leben* is the stereotyped form followed in the consultation of the oracle on the part of childless women. Undoubtedly the difficulty of sustaining his position has led Bultmann to modify it significantly by the concession that there were different strata in Hellenistic Christianity of which one was Jewish-Hellenistic—a quantity still dimly recognized, as he admits.

---

[1] R. Bultmann, *Die Erforschung der Synoptischen Evangelien* (1925), pp. 21–23.

[2] *Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition* (1931), p. 57.

[3] *Das Lukas Evangelium* (Handbuch zum N.T.), 142.

[4] Cf. Marti, *Biblisch-Aramaische Grammatik*, 109.

[5] Klostermann, *op. cit.* 310 .

[6] 'I must do my work to-day and to-morrow, and on the third day go on my way' (*i.e. die*); cf. Torrey, *op. cit.* 310.

[7] Cf. a similar highly emotional narrative Gn 49^{1-10}; contrast the Greek ideal expression of such emotions, *Iliad*, ix. 488–500.

[8] *Op. cit.* 329 f.

[9] *Archiv für Orientforschung*, x. (1935), pp. 77–80.

A review of such facts, as we have sought to bring forward, must lead to the conclusion that the progressive changes within the Early Christian Church which the *Formgeschichtlicher* stress must have taken place within an Aramaic-speaking and writing community. In whatever part of Syria or Palestine we place it, the evidences show that it was Palestinian in background.[1] Theories which do not take account of Aramaic Gospels, it would seem, must be readapted to the evidences or abandoned. If it be held by some that the Gospels reflect a situation that is foreign to a Palestinian environment since they are influenced by the doctrine of a miraculously born *savior-lord* who imported to his followers a secret *gnosis* and instituted a sacramental meal therewith, and if it be deduced that, since such things are inconsistent with Aramaic documents,[2] there could have been no such documents, then it must be answered that whether such premisses be right or wrong, the conclusion is invalidated by the strength of the philological arguments against it.

---

[1] Kundsin, *op. cit.* 37; see also C. H. Dodd, *The Gospel Parables*, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, xvi. No. 2 (1932).

[2] Riddle, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, liv. 135.

Christianity in Action.

The Christian Faith and Freedom.

By the Reverend David Cairns, B.A., Bridge of Allan.

A few years ago men would have laughed at the suggestion that in the near future Christians would have again to undergo such persecutions as their spiritual ancestors suffered because they refused to put a pinch of incense on the Roman imperial altars. But to-day events in various totalitarian countries have reminded us sharply that the day of idolatry is not yet over—a fact which we should never have forgotten. In Japan, in some places, school-pupils are compelled to be present at rites in Shinto shrines where prayers are made to the divine ancestors of the nation; and the policy of Soviet Russia in dealing with Christian institutions is not more significant than the hostility of the German Government to the Confessional Church, the reconciliation of Hitler with Ludendorff, and the State encouragement given to the mystical ideas of Rosenberg. The problem 'Christ or Cæsar' has once more become a vital issue.

The aim of this article is to maintain that idolatry always results in the destruction of freedom, and that only where there is a background of Christian ideas in a community can there be full security of freedom for its members, irrespective of their religious beliefs. The cynic will point out that often the Christian Church has itself led the way in persecution. This must be conceded, for the Church has often too little understood the implications of its own faith. That faith, rightly understood, is nevertheless the only true buttress of social and political freedom. If this assertion be true, the wide importance of the Conference of the Churches held at Oxford in July will be seen. Here the Life and Work Œcumenical Movement was dealing not merely with private concerns which are of interest only to the minority who are actively concerned with the work of the Christian Church. The truth is that here rather the human rights of every man and the rights of the different forms of voluntary association were being buttressed against the spring-tides of State absolutism, State idolatry. Karl Barth is right when he says, 'Theology and the Church are the natural frontiers of everything, even of the totalitarian State.' Who would have thought, a few years ago, that the imposing structure of Trade Unionism and Socialism in Germany would have collapsed so quickly before the onslaught of Nazism, while the numerically insignificant and divided Protestant Church would weather the storm?

How is it that the Christian conception of freedom is the only foundation on which political and social freedom can be securely built up? To understand this we must consider shortly the Christian doctrine of man. According to Christian belief two main things can be said about man. Firstly, God created man for communion with Himself. Therefore in each person there is a centre of infinite value. Secondly, All men are sinful. Something has gone wrong. Whatever our ideas about the

Fall, all Christians are agreed on this fact, that man is prone to use his freedom in a wrong way. He seeks self-expression at the expense of others. He does not respect their freedom, their Godward relation, as he ought to.

Now from this first principle of the Christian Doctrine of man we can deduce the moral obligation to give men external freedom. Without a certain freedom from external hindrance—freedom to do right or wrong—no man can attain to that higher freedom, which Luther has called the Freedom of a Christian Man—the freedom to love and obey God with all one's will. To will the good is the chief end of man, but before he can do this, he must be free simply to will effectively.

But since men are sinful, there is a constant temptation to misuse this freedom and to injure the freedom of others. Hence Christian doctrine holds that there must be restrictions on freedom. There must be things that no man is allowed to do. And to keep men from abusing freedom, there must be sanctions of force—such as the State possesses. Here is the Christian justification of the force of the State with reference to its citizens. Behind the law there stands the police force, behind the police are the troops. It is true that often we obey the law because we feel that we ought to, but no one with a sense for political realities would remove all the sanctions of the law, or maintain that those who break it do so out of ignorance and in innocence. The sanction of force behind the law is necessary, and is due to the fact of sin.

Let us examine certain political movements, with a view to showing how they ignore these two principles. The laissez-faire school of liberalism never suggested that the sanctions of the law should be altogether abrogated, but it did allow far too much liberty in economic affairs to the exploiter. Thus doing, it forgot the second principle of the Christian doctrine of man. The result was that the economically powerful class so misused its liberty as to destroy the liberty of the employed. The laissez-faire school believed that by some preconcerted harmony in the universe unlicensed greed and self-seeking would turn out to the universal advantage. The Bible, however, teaches that the wages of sin is death. By its neglect of the limitations of freedom the laissez-faire school showed itself unrealistic also in its conception of the positive principle of liberty. This was an ideal that had come to laissez-faire liberalism by devious ways from the first tenet of the Christian doctrine of man—the faith that man was created in God's image. In giving a few men unbridled liberty this type of liberalism made liberty itself something like a mockery, thus giving some justification to the Socialist taunt, 'What use is the vote to a wage-slave?'

We have just been passing through a time when liberalism was in the dock, and it was fashionable to rail at it as an effete faith. It has been too easy to revile it, and to forget that there is a true Christian liberalism which is very different from the laissez-faire type. In this second sense of the word liberalism is not so much the expression of a political faith as the belief that every man must have a certain and limited freedom granted to him. This liberalism it is which says to the State and the other organizations which are potential tyrants over the individual—'Thus far and no farther.' This liberalism is an essential expression of Christianity, whether it happen to be the conviction of a professing Christian, agnostic, or atheist. This liberalism we must never let go, it is one of our most treasured possessions. With it goes that freedom which is the right of humanity as such, and this liberalism is itself really based on the two tenets of the Christian doctrine of man, however confusedly these may be understood.

Like laissez-faire liberalism, Fascism and Communism, however different in many aspects, neglect both these two tenets of the Christian doctrine of man. Communism is the clearest offender in this, but only because its political philosophy is more clearly thought out than are the philosophical systems of the Fascists and Nazists. Communism holds that all the actions which appear to be the result of sin are really the result of the class-system, and that when this is destroyed there will be no more sin. A millennium is coming, in which no sanction of force will be necessary, because the Communist lambs will lie down together, there being Capitalist lions left. Every one will willingly obey Communist doctrine down to the smallest detail. Similarly, though less clearly, there is an unjustified optimism about human nature in Fascism and Nazism. How else could they repose all their confidence in any human principle, such as race, or nation, or State? For these are their Messiahs and Redeemers. For, after all, whatever be the governing principle in a totalitarian State, it is merely human nature in one of its traits, or constituent principles, in which all confidence is placed.

The Communist and Fascist neglect of the first principle of the Christian doctrine of man is too obvious to need more than mention. The philosophies which glory in the suppression of freedom have forgotten that man was created free by God for communion with Himself. Thus we come to the conclusion that only if we hold fast to the two Christian beliefs about man, can we find a true solid basis for freedom. The failure of the totalitarian States to take account of sin is natural, for without freedom there cannot be sin. Neglect both, and you have not persons, but things. Only a person can sin, a thing is determined by its environment.

Here it is necessary to enter a caveat. Christians do not all live in agreement with Christian belief. Unfortunately many of them have been persecutors, or have failed to see their duty to secure for their employees that freedom which all men should have. And in many respects the Communists have acted in a more Christ-like way than the Christians. Christians have spoken love, but their actions have sometimes spelt hate, while in some cases Communist actions have spelt love, while their theory was one of hate. But that does not alter the fact that they have no philosophical justification for these actions, and a man's actions tend to sink to the level that is justified by his theory.

If we have demonstrated in the preceding part of this article that the Christian faith gives a secure basis for freedom, let us in the latter part examine the nature of idolatry, and see how it necessarily results in the destruction of freedom. Those who believe in God will perhaps be agreed in maintaining that all life has, as it were, a triangular structure. I have a relation to God, and also a relation to my neighbour, while my neighbour has not only a relation to me but also an independent relation to God. In nothing that I do or am, can I be regarded as isolated from the other two corners of the triangle—God, and my neighbour. Out of these relations I cannot escape without ceasing altogether to be human. Every man, even the atheist, has this connexion with God; he can no more escape it by ignoring it than we can escape an obligation by ignoring it. His atheism may be in part the fault of others—a false idea of God may have been given to him, so that he fails to recognize as divine the origin of the communications which God sends to him, and the relations into which God seeks to enter with him.

If a man's relation to God were perfect, his will would accept wholeheartedly God's will for the world—redemption for himself and for his neighbour. Therefore his relationship to his neighbour would be one of complete redemptive love and respect for personality. In so far as a man does not love his neighbour and love and obey God, his relationship does not return along the line to God, but along another line to a false apex. This apex represents the man's idol for the time being, an idol which he creates. Every false relationship to my neighbour implies an idol, and every idol implies a false relationship to my neighbour.

Let us trace out more closely the connexion here. If I am in a false relationship to my neighbour, I am not in the relationship to God that God desires for me. I am obeying some other command than God's voice. Some desire or aim chosen by me gives me direction. That is my idol for the time being. And when I create an idol, it is in the image of myself or some aspect of my own nature, or some power in myself. I use this to dominate my neighbour. The will to power over my neighbour by means of such idols is not necessarily conscious. But if I worship an idol, I either do not know the God who created my neighbour, or am ignoring the true God. So I also forget the side of the triangle which connects my neighbour with God, if I may so put it, his private wire to God. And it is this which constitutes his true humanity. He then easily falls a prey to the domination and tyranny which my idol exercises on all that fall within its kingdom.

But this tendency to dominate others is not the final stage of idolatry. For our personality only finds its true expression in obedience to God and love to men. Hence any erection of an idol can only result in the domination of ourselves by that which is the caricature of ourselves, a part of our nature torn from its true context and exalted at the expense of all the rest of our nature, our personality. Such an idol becomes an idol that terrifies us, a cancerous growth drawing its life from our dissolution. A man who has made sensuality his idol has exalted one side of his nature which under God's guidance might have found its true expression. But now he is become himself its slave, and this one side of his nature, projected on the background of infinity, enslaves him and becomes his master, as well as dominating others. The man who seeks autonomy, in the sense of independence from God's rule, becomes in the end a slave himself, the slave of fragments of his own nature, which he has invested with the power of the Absolute. The technician may become, for example, the slave of the machine, a horrible and inhuman slavery, if he regards technical efficiency as an end, and not as a means, and forgets that man has only one true end, to glorify God and enjoy him for ever. Technical efficiency in life may and should be a means to this.

The danger for the State from the Christian point of view is that it may become the victim of such an idolatrous idea—a kind of demon possession. For example, the idea of the Aryan race and its tradition may so dominate a certain European nation that it becomes in time practically a stud-farm, and its citizens are no longer treated as persons, with rights of their own, but become merely links in a chain of pure-bred Aryans. And of all the groups into which the community is divided, the State is the most dangerous if it once becomes thus idol-possessed, because of the sanctions of force which it rightly holds, and may use to enforce its idolatrous ideas.

Let us now proceed to a short diagnosis of the present situation. There are two characteristics of this situation which call especially for notice. The first is the very great complexity of our civilization which has become like a very finely adjusted machine or sensitive organism, which can be very easily thrown out of gear. The lower animals can survive with a primitive nervous organization, but a surgeon who is to perform a delicate operation must have a nervous system which can help him to work quickly, exactly, and decisively. Our present civilization, if ruin is to be averted, must be much more delicately adjusted than were the civilizations of the past. Lack of organization and the incoherence caused by each individual seeking his own interests, will no longer do in the modern world.

Beside this increase in complexity and sensitiveness we must set the fact that there is no longer in the modern world the psychological unity that there was. Ways of living and thinking are different more and more, and one can no longer count on the existence of one religious background which will influence the thoughts and actions of the great majority of men.

The result is that disorganization is much more of a danger than ever before, and if disorganization comes, then governments are discredited, there is unemployment, starvation, and danger of revolution. The inevitable result of this need for greater efficiency and organization is that more and more functions in the community which were once left to individual enterprise are taken over by the State, and the area in which individual liberty rules becomes ever more and more restricted. This is itself inevitable, and is, from an ethical point of view neither to be praised or blamed. If we are to live at all in the modern world we must be organized.

But the danger lies in this fact, that in order to combat the increasing lack of unity in each people, various governments are now trying to bring their various peoples into line by setting up the tyranny of a State idol, or religion. Citizens in different nations of the world are being dragooned into support of the State worship with cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, and dulcimer. And, as the idols are rivals, the confusion becomes greater, and the pressure on the individuals for moral conscription becomes greater. Beyond the necessary increase in State control and organization there has entered in a pathological element, an idolatry which dominates and terrorizes.

It is interesting to conjecture in what illegitimate ways the State may attempt to infringe the liberty of the individual even in those countries like our own, where, happily, the totalitarian claim has not yet been made. We can get some inkling of what might happen from looking at the case of other countries. The freedom of the press may be assaulted. Here we must distinguish between a legitimate censorship of the press and an illegitimate one. Where does one draw the line between fair criticism of a leader in a foreign country, and unfair personal attacks on such a person, and insults which the Government ought to punish by fine or imprisonment? Who is to secure the impartiality of the judge, who will watch over the watchman?

Then we must also watch vigilantly over the freedom of education. Children in school and students in the universities must never be treated by their teachers as the potter treats the clay. To do this would be more than to usurp God's place, for God never treats man merely as a thing, but always as a reasonable person. There are more kinds of compulsion than the physical, and some of them may be unconsciously exercised by the teacher. Mr. Kurt Hahn, headmaster of the new Public School at Gordonstown, tells a story of the visit of the parents of two pupils to the school. Both expressed their satisfaction with the change that the school was making in their boys, but the first complained to Mr. Hahn that he was making his boy a revolutionary Socialist, while the second asked, 'Why have you made my boy a Fascist?' Mr. Hahn gave them no direct answer, but introduced them to one another, and left them to talk it out. That is liberalism in the finest sense, liberalism which expresses the spirit of Christianity. Such a refusal to mould the character and views of another does not mean that no one has a right to influence another, it merely means that we should take care to use such methods as respect the personality of our neighbour.

Then there is the whole problem of the social activity of the Church. Many functions that once belonged to the Church now belong to the State, and it is not wrong that this should be so, but we see the danger in secularization of such functions in Russia, where the Church is not allowed to do anything save to hold services of worship. In Germany the same State tyranny is expressed by the fact that all youth organizations save the Hitler Youth Movement have been suppressed. This is fatal, for if Christianity is to be real at all, it must find expression outside the Church doors. It is an essential that the Church should be independent of the State in all matters pertaining to Christ's Kingdom. Luther made the mistake of saying that the Church was independent in spiritual matters, but in material affairs she might receive her stipend and direction from the State. This is an unreal distinction. For if the State has control over the property of the Church, then the State can control the Church's policy by threatening to withhold supplies. If we are in favour of the nationalization of all wealth, we should realize that such control would cut away all liberty, not only from the Church, but also from all other forms of association, which within their own legitimate territories ought to be free from State dictation. The Universities should have a measure of freedom —or else the danger may arise, that when the State becomes totalitarian, the Professors will only be allowed to teach certain doctrines, as in Germany and Russia to-day.

But, it may be objected, are these not all outside questions ? Is it likely that this country of freedom would ever be subjected to a tyranny of that kind ? The answer to such an objection is not merely that the cause of freedom is an international cause, and that we must not be so insular in our outlook as only to care for liberty within our own shores. We must also realize the uncertainty of political conditions even in our own land. Supposing that unemployment were to continue, or to increase during the next ten years, is there any one who could guarantee that Communism would not become a much more formidable force in Britain than it is to-day ? Or if the unstable equilibrium of Europe were to break down, is it not probable that in the ensuing confusion the economic conditions of this country would change very much for the worse ? And if that be so, who can guarantee that a great expansion of Communism would not result, for its real roots in the modern world are in the hunger of the people.

But if Communism increases, who can suppose that the propertied classes will go down without a great struggle ? And what is more likely than that they will organize themselves in what has shown itself to be a highly efficient form of organization, under a Fascist dictatorship, probably in forms more congenial to the genius of our people than the German or Italian forms. In either case, if Communism or Fascism were to triumph, the first victim would be the liberty which is the right of every human being. It is therefore high time that we were looking into the very foundations of our freedom, and maintaining a watch lest they be fatally undermined.

It has been the argument of this article that the real foundations of that freedom lie in the Christian gospel, which teaches that man was made by God for communion with Him, and that forgiveness for sin and new life are given through Christ. What are we Christians to do in the face of these threats to freedom ? Our first task is the proclamation of the gospel—one might almost say our task is to make the gospel available to the modern world. For there is a temptation to equate the proclamation of the gospel with the preaching of the Word in our half-filled churches. This is necessary, but it does not exhaust our duty. Henry Drummond used to say, ' Either the gospel has lost its power, or it is not being made available. I am convinced that it has not lost its power.' The conclusion that he drew was that the Christian Church, that Christian men and women, were failing in their duty. We of the Church are in danger of failing to recognize the stupendous task that lies before the Church, before us. To-day the message of the gospel is turned aside by millions as a mere irrelevancy. That indifference is in large measure the fault of the Church. The first task is therefore the proclamation of the gospel by means of preaching, personal witness, service, writing. Compared with this other tasks are secondary, other defence of liberty is like playing a hose on a house which is already blazing. For Christianity is the alternative to idolatrous systems which suppress freedom, and we must not only say this but believe it with all the passion of which we are capable, and work for its propagation with a zeal equal to that of the Communist missionaries.

But there is another thing which we must do. There are others who do not profess the Christian Faith, who have yet a conviction of the sanctity of human personality, and with them we must make common cause against the idolaters, even though we may not agree with our allies on every point. And in the last place, the test of persecution may come to us, as it has come in other lands in Europe and Asia. And if it does, we must be willing to suffer for the truth.

Literature.

JESUS AND HIS SACRIFICE.

Dr. Vincent Taylor's work on the historical and literary criticism of the Gospels has rightly earned for him a high place among the New Testament scholars of our day. The latest volume from his pen—*Jesus and His Sacrifice* (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net)—will not only enhance his reputation in a sphere which he has made his own but will reveal his capacity to apply the results of critical research to the interpretation of Christian doctrine. Here he appears in the rôle of 'New Testament critic cum theologian'; and we hope that his courageous endeavour will serve to deliver the critical study of Christian sources from the suspicion that it is but remotely related to the 'things that matter most.' Certainly, it will provoke a renewed interest in the doctrine of the Atonement and lead, in the case of many readers, to a fresh orientation of thought and worship.

The theme of the book may be simply stated. Dr. Taylor is convinced that if we are to come to a right understanding of the significance of the Cross, the attitude of Jesus Himself towards it must be closely studied. In the first part of the work, the Old Testament background is reviewed, and careful consideration is given to the following conceptions: Kingdom of God, the Messianic Hope, the Son of Man, the Son, the Servant of Yahweh, and Sacrifice. If, the writer contends, Jesus interpreted the doctine of the Son of Man in the light of Isaiah 53, we may envisage the possibility that He regarded His own suffering as a sacrificial offering in which men might participate. Dr. Taylor recognizes the difficulties that beset any treatment of the conception of sacrifice, but does not hesitate to affirm his belief that implicit in sacrificial worship is the idea of a life offered to God with which the worshipper may associate himself through appropriate ritual acts. The extent to which this idea was present to the mind of Jesus can only be discerned by an examination of His sayings, and this task is undertaken in the second part of the work. A most illuminating survey is made of the Passion sayings in the Gospels together with the sayings in the Pauline narrative of the Last Supper. The former are, for sufficiently good reasons, studied in the order in which they appear in the sources, and the section as a whole is arranged as follows: (1) the Markan sayings; (2) the sayings in the L tradition; (3) the sayings in 1 Co 11$^{23\text{-}25}$; (4) the Johannine sayings. In the third and final division of his theme the author draws out the implications of the Passion sayings. He considers that they presuppose that Jesus believed that His Passion was in accordance with the will of God and intimately related to the Divine Rule; that it was an integral element in His Messianic vocation; that it was representative and vicarious; and that men are permitted to enter, in some measure, into His redemptive service. In order that men might share in the power of the life that was surrendered to the will of the Father and participate in its sacrificial ministry, Jesus provided the rite of the Last Supper. (It is obvious to the reader that the Eucharist is central to the mind of the author.) The theological position to which the results of the foregoing inquiries lead is succinctly stated in the final chapter. The Abelardian theory is rejected, partly because it lacks an adequate basis in the Gospels, partly because it fails to answer the question, 'How can a man repent?' We are reminded that a theology of the Atonement must rest upon the data of Gospel history and tradition, and be interpreted in the light of the thought and experience of the Church. From this point of view, three affirmations are made concerning the self-offering of Jesus. It is (1) His perfect obedience to the will of His Father; (2) His perfect submission to the judgment of God upon sin; (3) the perfect expression of His perfect penitence for the sins of men. Due consideration is given to the objections sometimes raised against the conception of vicarious penitence, and it is urged that the offering only avails in so far as the individual shares in its redemptive power. In the closing pages the author relates his findings to Christian worship and practice.

We predict that this book will speedily be recognized as a standard work on the Atonement. It is marked throughout by religious insight, competent scholarship, courageous thought, and lucid expression. Emphatically this is a contribution which no serious student of theology can afford to neglect.

THE FUTURE OF CHRISTIANITY.

The Future of Christianity, by Professor E. S. Brightman (Abingdon Press; $1.50), is a sturdy and vigorous book, realistic in style and direct in statement of problems, tending at times to rely on assertion rather than reasoning, but accurate in its analysis of present situations and optimistic in its presentation of possible solutions. Those who have a liking for metaphysical completeness may be troubled by the author's dualism, according to which God is represented as constantly struggling with a mass of obstacles and suffering which He did not create but has to bear as a burden; but the whole trend of the book is towards a deepening of the conviction of the supremacy of a God of goodness; and the writer's faith is triumphantly expressed over and over again, especially in his concluding pages. For him, God alone has a totalitarian claim on life, and can make good that claim.

The end of the book is better than its beginning. In the opening chapter the dissertation on the rather commonplace consideration that all our knowledge and all our action is for the sake of the future, and the elaborate distinctions drawn between the predictions of science and the predictions of faith are hardly necessary for the main argument. The chapter on the future of the Bible and of the Church contains much penetrating analysis. If the reading of the Bible seems to have fallen on evil days, this, according to the author, is due to the complexities introduced by the substitution of the Modernist for the Fundamentalist point of view; to the mechanized character of present-day civilization which makes the Biblical environment seem archaic; and, finally, to the growing consciousness of the misuse of the Bible in education which has led to a demand for the abandonment of its use altogether. But remedies can be found, in a scientific and more truly historical study of the Bible, and in a transition from a dogmatic to a functional view of its value. Dr. Brightman does not falter in his belief in the central importance of the Bible for the future of religion; 'the Bible will be of permanent value as long as there is any religious faith in the world.' The Church, also, notwithstanding its present spiritual inertia, its tolerated divisions, its failure to bridge the gulf between the learned and the unlearned in religious matters, its lack of effective social programme, is a necessity for Christianity, and there are grounds for encouragement regarding its future when we compare its present situation even in its darkest colours with its condition in some of the periods of the past, and when we note also the signs of co-operation, the weakening of conservatism, and the undoubted strengthening within the Church of a social conscience.

Dr. Brightman is at his best in his chapter on belief in God. He has a genius for discovering confessions of faith even in the writings of professed atheists, and finds, for example, that Bernard Russell in his distinction between what is worthy and what is unworthy, is implicitly affirming a faith in the divine source of values. The author himself is fully ready to admit that there must be changes in the nature of belief in God, and that 'the only really unorthodox thinker is one who thinks he knows all about God, and all he needs to know.' His own faith he bases mainly upon the trustworthiness of the universe, implied in the validity of scientific knowedge and the aspirations of human life. In addition he asks us to reflect upon the significance of the possession of reason and of human personality, upon the emergence of novelty—so greatly stressed by modern scientists—which surely cannot be emergence out of nothing. Finally, those who profess to pay attention to facts must take account of all the facts, and surely cannot on this principle, disregard the data of universal religious experience.

The last chapter of the book deals with the problem of man, and establishes the conclusion that every reason for faith in man is a reason for faith in God. Various schemes for the future of mankind detached from the thought of God, are passed in review. From some of them Dr. Brightman can extract testimony out of what is apparently anti-religious. Communism, for example, is 'for ever seeking an ideal end by unideal means which contradict the end sought,' and one part at least of the meaning of Communism and Fascism alike is that 'God is using them to demonstrate to enfeebled Christendom the transforming power of faith.' All the schemes indeed which leave out religion are not so much a peril to Christianity as a challenge to it and an opportunity for it. There is in general abundant reason for hopefulness. Pessimism, even, is a contradiction to its own gloom, for no one could be a pessimist who did not entertain an ideal of something better, and the driving force of radicalism and conservatism alike is to make the future beautiful and secure. Acute though the present crisis may be, there is yet less blindness and ignorance about it than about any previous crisis in the history of the world. The Christian moreover may go further than knowledge of need; he may, and must, have assured faith in a Christian solution of world-problems both as they affect the individual and the race.

NEW TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION.

Dr. Edgar J. Goodspeed of Chicago has added to his already numerous publications a full-dress

Introduction to the New Testament (Cambridge University Press; 11s. 6d. net). In his preface Dr. Goodspeed truly remarks that the primary concern of the writer on Introduction is to interpret, to make understandable, the literature he deals with, to appreciate and appraise the use his authors have made of their sources, and to find out the ends to which they used them. The science of New Testament Introduction, he holds, has suffered from the 'atomism' which, in pursuing little problems and small sections, loses sight of the significance of the whole. In general we agree; but we wish that Dr. Goodspeed had been a little more specific. For when we read his own Introduction we find it just like several others that have appeared in recent times. The most interesting point he makes is about corpuses (the plural is his). It was a decisive thing, he holds, for Christian literature when the first corpus was published, and our New Testament writings fall into groups according as they were written before or after the appearance of the first corpus, which consisted of the Pauline letters. There was risk of their disappearance, but some thirty-five years after Paul's death the publication of Luke-Acts led to a revival of interest in Paul, and somebody gave himself the pious task of collecting and publishing as a corpus what letters of Paul he could find. That set the fashion, and in due course there appeared the corpuses of the Pastorals, the Letters to the Churches of Asia, the Johannines, the Ignatians, and so on. This is certainly interesting and not improbable. The existence of the Paulines as a corpus may be said to be demonstrated by the fact that in later literature which quotes Paul the whole corpus is quoted from, with some exceptions which admit of easy explanation.

When, however, Dr. Goodspeed argues that our 'Ephesians' is a sort of introduction to the Pauline corpus from the hand of its editor, we find it extraordinarily difficult to believe. Dr. Goodspeed attempts no explanation of why an introduction to the Paulines should be so difficult in language, syntax, and thought, as every expositor finds 'Ephesians' to be. Many will continue to regard our 'Ephesians' as 'the letter from Laodicea' (Col. 4[16]) more probably than our 'Philemon' as Dr. Goodspeed, following Wieseler, argues.

The principle of avoiding troublesome details is surely carried too far when Dr. Goodspeed avoids all reference to the most difficult questions raised by Galatians,—the visits to Jerusalem, the Council of Jerusalem, and the circumcision of Timothy in the very region to which, on Dr. Goodspeed's view, the Epistle was addressed.

We do not quite understand why in dealing with the Gospels the writer gives no consideration to the views of Dibelius and Torrey. No student is fairly treated unless those theories, the most important that have been advanced in recent years, are explained to him.

While we feel constrained to pass those criticisms, we cordially welcome the admirable treatment of the purpose of the individual books of the New Testament, and the excellent summaries of their contents.

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

Some thirty years ago Sir Robert Falconer, K.C.M.G., D.Litt., D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., demitted his Chair of New Testament Greek in Pine Hill College, Halifax, in order to fill the position of President of the University of Toronto. For twenty-five years the heavy administrative duties of that high office prevented his having much time for the continuance of those New Testament studies, the fruits of which had been so widely appreciated. We rejoice that the leisure which is now his has recalled him to his desk as a New Testament scholar. We owe to his renewed study a notable contribution—*The Pastoral Epistles: Introduction, Translation and Notes* (Clarendon Press; 12s. 6d. net). The work has a special interest to us because the reason for its production is the dissatisfaction which Sir Robert felt with the article on the Pastorals which he contributed to the 'Dictionary of the Apostolic Church.' This book certainly does not make the article obsolete but supplements and corrects it. Since the article was composed much has been written on the Pastorals, and Sir Robert's own mind has been busy, and now we have a work on the Pastorals which no New Testament scholar or student can afford to neglect.

For long the Pastorals have been felt to present problems, and scholars are not nearly unanimous as to the solution. Few will now be found to maintain that as we have them they come from the pen of St. Paul. Linguistic and theological considerations forbid that view. There is general agreement that the three Epistles are a *corpus* constructed out of various original materials some of which were written by St. Paul, but opinions differ as to how much is from his hand, and still more as to the circumstances under which the Pauline and the other fragments were written.

In his 'Introduction' Sir Robert gives his own view of such questions. The earliest in time is the Epistle to Titus. As we have it, it contains the instructions which Paul had given to Titus written down by Titus himself for the benefit of the Cretan Church authorities. Second Timothy contains the largest amount of genuine Pauline material. It is a message of Paul to Timothy which St. Luke actually wrote, its diction showing strong Lukan traits. Those two letters were edited by one who incorporated some Pauline material, both written and oral, into our 'First Timothy.'

This view does explain the linguistic peculiarities of the group. We have a good deal of genuine Pauline material and some valuable Pauline reminiscences, but written by three different people.

Another problem is to fit the material into Paul's life and into the recorded movements of Paul, Timothy, and Titus. In Sir Robert's view Second Timothy requires an acquittal of St. Paul and a subsequent journey into Asia about A.D. 63. That has long been a favoured hypothesis. The main 'snag' appears in the view of the movements of Titus. Sir Robert has to postulate a visit of Titus to Corinth of which there is no record.

Other matters dealt with are of great interest and value, such as the religious conceptions of the Pastorals, the errors in Ephesus and Crete, and the ecclesiastical organization in those regions.

The translation is excellent, modern but dignified; while the Notes reveal penetrating judgment, and really illumine the text.

WHAT MODERNISM HAS TO SAY.

The Annual Conference of Modern Churchmen was held at Girton College, Cambridge, from 30th August to 4th September, and had as its theme 'Christianity and the Religious Crisis.' Fifteen papers were read, and they are published under that title in *The Modern Churchman* for October (Blackwell; 3s. 6d. net). Among the best known writers are Bishop Barnes, Canon Roger Lloyd, Dr. F. E. Tennant, Canon Guy Rogers, Dr. St. John Ervine (the 'Dr.' gives us a shock. What University did itself the honour of making the eminent author an LL.D.?), Sir Arnold Wilson, Editor of the 'Nineteenth Century,' and Mr. Claud Mullins, the magistrate.

In the first paper Bishop Barnes gives an analysis of 'The Present Religious Crisis.' He thinks that in the last two decades Christianity has suffered a set-back more serious than any which it has experienced since the third century of our era. The reasons are various—the effects of the new discoveries of science, the corrosive influence of philosophical speculation and the critico-historical investigations of the origin of Christianity. We see the results in every country. In Germany, he says, the tide has been checked a little by the dictatorial, rhetorical, and anti-intellectual movement led by Barth. But in England we see it flowing strongly. Church attendance is little more than a quarter of what it was a generation ago. None of the churches can get an adequate supply of the right kind of men for their ministry. The number of men and women who are ready to give religious instruction in the schools is diminishing. And (worst of all) there has been a serious decline in personal interest in religion.

This depressing analysis is followed by several essays in which the relation of the Church to various branches of knowledge is expounded: the New Science and the New Philosophy, Modern Historical Research and Biblical Criticism, the Economic and Political Situation, and the New Morality. These lead to another series on the solutions of the modern problem offered by various systems of life and organization—Communism, Fascism, Democracy. Three very interesting papers discuss the Fundamentalist solution (a courageous, original, and positive contribution), the Humanist solution, and the Romanist solution. Mr. Mullins then tells us how much real Christianity is to be found outside the churches, and pleads for a recognition of it. And finally we have the essay on what is to be done about it: 'The Opportunity and Mission of the Church of England.'

We confess to some feeling of disappointment with this volume and its contents. It is all so negative. We must get rid of the dogmas of the past—that is the burden of a great deal of it. But what are we to present to men in the place of that which we throw away? That is the weakness of this Conference. Some time ago a distinguished Liberal theologian said that the defect of the Liberal School was that it has no gospel, and that it would never win the world till it showed that it had a gospel. It is the suspicion of this more than mere traditionalism that makes many people Fundamentalists. They feel that without a positive redeeming gospel we have nothing to say to the world's need. A great deal of what is written by these able men is true. Much of the criticism levelled at the Church hits the mark. We shall not save the world merely by 'dogmas.' There is a large body of people who try to practise Christ's teaching outside the Church. We must open our minds to the new knowledge.

We must accept the truth wherever we find it, and give it a place in our Christian philosophy. All that is true, and worth saying again and again. But we wish the writers of this volume could have asked each other: 'What really is our message to the sin and distress of the world?' and have put the answer in one more essay.

BEATRICE HANKEY.

The life and work of Beatrice Hankey illustrate a rare combination of the sources and principles of true Christian evangelism and philanthropy—the early home-life with the Mother's influence at its centre in some peculiarly happy and original ways; the care of an invalid sister; the long years of quiet preparation, with a Bible Class and faithful Bible study, for wider work; the willingness to be led on against personal desire, and apparent aptitude; the importance, training, and oversight of the Group; an unfailing gaiety in the home, in the house-party, or in the huts; the peace and beauty of the short last days, when the work was done—all these things stand out in the story which has been told by Charles E. Raven and Rachel F. Heath. The title of the biography is *One Called Help* (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net). We are led on from the Bible Class and temperance work among the fisher-folk at Walmer, through the lonely wrestling on the moors that stormy Whitsunday, to the formation of the fellowship of the Knights, the house-parties at the Chantry at S. Augustine's and the wider Camelots, and thence to the Pilgrim groups ever ready for immediate pioneer service, in the Home huts and parochial missions during the War, and afterwards to the stricken areas of the Staffordshire and South Wales coalfields.

The idea of the Knighthood sprang from an interesting instance of the way in which a thought can grow as it is translated into another language: the term for a disciple, 'the learning knight' (*knecht*) meant originally just the learning servant, or follower or henchman, but turned into English invited all the associations and inspiration of Mallory and Tennyson, Arthur and the Round Table, of Camelot and the Quests. At the Chantry house-parties each room bore the name of a 'grace,' and its occupant was called by that name during her stay; and it was hence that the two sisters derived the names by which they became so widely known for the rest of their lives, (Pilgrim) Help and (Pilgrim) Rest.

The house-parties developed also into larger quiet weeks and gatherings, held at Heathfield and elsewhere; the group of leisured young women became an extraordinarily mixed assembly in which 'men and women, young free lances and middle-aged Victorians, Anglo-Catholics and strict Protestants, Tory and Socialist, leisured and labourer, all met together. The family note prevailed but deepened . . . the little group of friends had grown into a family so large that it was no longer possible for each knight to know all the rest. . . . They were scattered far and wide in various capacities, doctors, nurses, missionaries, clergy, teachers, welfare workers, artists, secretaries, business folk; they represented many varieties of Christian experience, and held widely different opinions; but in Knighthood they were one.'

A marked feature of this biography is the, sometimes long, extracts from her commonplace and notebooks, as well as from her letters, forming a considerable and valuable portion of the book. We quote, 'To a Timid Knight.'

'No Knight must say, "I can't do anything myself but I can pray." Prayer is not an idle refuge for the destitute.

'It's not humble, it's merely cowardly and idle to say, "I am not aspiring for any great thing for the King: just to be good in a quiet ordinary way is all I want." You saint George Herbert, would you ever have written those lines beloved by all G.F.S. associates:

"Who sweeps a room as for Thy laws,
Makes that and th' action fine,"

if you could but have known the use that would be made of them? People are too content with "sweeping rooms" (with the inevitable dust involved), when they are called to put out their very best and highest powers of brain and heart and imagination.'

THE ESKIMO.

Mr. C. E. Whittaker has spent fifty years among the Eskimo tribes and so he has every right to be heard when he describes their life and customs. He draws a picture of a quiet, peaceable people, who, in spite of the great hardships of their life, get an amazing amount of quiet pleasure out of everyday happenings. Mr. Whittaker's first years were spent at Herschel Island and the later ones at Fort McPherson. As the latter is the headquarters of the Hudson Bay Company there is little doubt that he is connected with this although it does not seem to be definitely stated. The title of the book is *Arctic Eskimo* (Seeley, Service; 16s. net). Some idea of its scope can be got from the chapter headings—Eskimo Characteristics, Religion and Allied Subjects, Government and Justice, Diseases and Treatment, Mechanics, Folk-Lore, Whale-Hunting, etc.

In the chapter on the religion of the Eskimo Mr. Whittaker says that, although he greatly admires the work and the writings of Mr. Stefansson, the arctic explorer, on this question he does not agree with him. Mr. Stefansson wrote disparagingly of Eskimo Christianity and declared that all the older beliefs persisted under the newer. Mr. Whittaker, on the other hand, says that 'The acceptance of Christianity has dispelled their fears of malignant nature and given them such a confidence in the overruling beneficence of the greater powers, that their minds have been free to expand in many directions. . . . One observing their daily life, hearing their conversation, seeing their methods, their houses, their furnishings and, above all, their animated faces and sparkling eyes, has no hesitation in saying that life is far richer and more worth while to them than ever before. They have a fine church at Aklavik, the central point of the delta, largely due to their own contributions of cash and labour.'

An interesting experiment made by the Government is described. Herds of deer have been brought from Alaska and the Eskimo are now being instructed in how to care for them. It is hoped soon to be able to distribute the reindeer amongst them when they have learned the art of herding. A certain and sufficient supply of food and clothing will then be assured to them.

Who Are You?, by Mr. Paul E. Johnson (Abingdon Press; $1.25), is the somewhat whimsical title of a very lively and arresting book. It is a book of popular psychology intended specially for young people. The writer deals with such topics as Personality, a Good Conscience, Adventures in Freedom, Is it Love?, The Goals We Seek. His treatment is characterized by much freshness and humour, but there is a strong vein of sound thought running through it. In the chapter on Right and Wrong some account is given of an interesting investigation by a group of university students who found certain moral values and formulated for themselves a table of standards. It should be said that the writer's conviction is that human personality finds its perfection in Jesus Christ.

The Study of the Bible (Cambridge University Press; 9s. net), by Ernest Cadman Colwell, Assistant Professor of New Testament at the University of Chicago, is designed to orient the reader in the field of the historical and literary criticism of the Bible. The author's learning and competence are beyond question, and the contents of his book are fresh and remarkably varied. The bibliographies are well selected and bear witness in themselves to the author's scholarly discrimination; they will be found useful not only by the student who has a general interest in the subject but also by the student whose interests are specialized. Chapters on the origin, growth, transmission, and translation of the Bible lead to the main part of the work, which deals first with the 'modernizing' method and secondly with the 'historical' method of interpretation. The former method has its feet firmly planted in the period in which the interpreter lives and in which he is, naturally, most interested. The latter method, on the other hand, finds the Bible's basic meaning with reference to the situation in which the Bible was written. It is the only method that commends itself to the scientific student of the Bible, and is cultivated on the sides both of literary and of historical criticism.

The Rev. Theodore Gerald Soares, Professor of Ethics in the California Institute of Technology and minister of Neighborhood Church, Pasadena, has done a very difficult thing with wonderful success. In a small book entitled *Three Typical Beliefs* (Cambridge University Press; 7s. net) he attempts to explain to one another the characteristic position of Roman Catholics, Fundamentalists, and Liberals respectively. He writes impartially and sympathetically; the note of criticism is absent except in so far as the Liberal Creed itself implies a criticism of the two others. The author shows just why the three attach supreme authority to the See of Rome, the Bible, and reason, respectively. Here and there some things seem to us not quite accurate. We may quarrel with the two opening sentences to the effect that Roman Catholicism is 'the most ancient form of Christianity,' and that that creed, ritual, discipline, and worship have continued 'unbroken and unchanged' through the centuries. Nothing could well be further from the truth. Then in the chapter on Fundamentalism the writer identifies Fundamentalism with orthodox Protestantism which can scarcely be allowed. Then we hope he is exaggerating when he says of Liberals that 'they do not know what they will believe next year.' In passing such criticisms we do not wish in any way to belittle a work which within its limits does much to fulfil the author's aim of affording the three types ready means of coming to understand one another better.

The Faith We Live By, by Mr. Earl L. Douglass (Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tenn.; $1.50), is an exposition of the Apostles' Creed. Mr. Douglass insists that Christianity is a historical religion, not only in the sense of having appeared in history, but in the sense of being dependent for its power on the facts it contains. Any tendency to belittle the historical element in Christianity robs it of its power. It is not a system of ideas but a supernatural revelation appearing in the stream of history. It is from this point of view the various statements in the Apostles' Creed are elucidated. The book will be found helpful by ministers and others whose duty it is to present the Christian facts in a simple form.

A book about Christ that has a point and purpose of its own is *The Man that Changed the World*, by Mr. Frederick B. Fisher (Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tenn.; $2.00). On the 'jacket' we are assured that 'surprise, pleasure, shock, satisfaction, the stimulation of new thoughts . . . these are some of the experiences which await the readers of this book, containing as it does a fresh understanding of Jesus.' It would be difficult to say more than that about Shakespeare or Homer, and publishers do a real disservice to a book by such exaggerations. But Mr. Fisher has really something to say, even if he says it somewhat flamboyantly. His point is that Christianity has been injured by being tied to the Old Testament. Jesus is the heir of all the ages and all the faiths. He is the product, not of the Jewish system, but of all Eastern religions. He is the answer to the thirst of humanity for life which these faiths express. The chapters of the book are entitled: The Ages that Yearned for Him, The Land that Cradled Him, The Church that Nurtured Him, The Messengers that Lived for Him, The World that is Being Made by Him, and The Soul that Finds Itself in Him.

The Rev. Ernest G. Braham, M.A., Ph.D., in *Personality in Philosophical Theology* (Epworth Press; 10s. 6d. net), does not claim that his study is original, and he is justified in his modesty, for although he gives us an excellent account of the leading philosophies from Plato to Kant, with occasional references to more modern writers, it cannot be said that he has presented us with much new matter or drawn any very fresh conclusions. He is right, however, in holding that the wider task he has undertaken is essential for an appreciation of his main purpose, namely, the setting forth of the development of the conception of personality. According to him, personality cannot be studied abstractly, but only in relation to the complete philosophical system of any writer. He therefore attempts to show that, however strongly any particular philosopher may profess to be indifferent to or to destroy the notion of the self, it is impossible to do this, and the sceptic must bear testimony implicitly at least to the fundamental importance of personality. For Locke, for example, personality is the central point of his discussion, and the relevant fact which makes his position intelligible, and even for Hume the self remains even when he has sunk within himself and fancied that he had discovered absolutely nothing; after all the impressions of which he makes so much must be his own impressions or they again are nothing.

Dr. Braham is a little hard on Descartes. He refuses to allow him the title of the 'Father of modern philosophy,' he demolishes the logical cogency of his famous *cogito ergo sum*, and he will not agree that he was so independent of former philosophers as he conceived himself to be. According to this criticism, Descartes' universal doubt, his subjectivism, his mathematical method, can all be paralleled in passages from Augustine.

In general Dr. Braham's thesis is that, as regards personality, idealism is faulty in that it sacrificed the individual to the whole, while rationalism gives on the whole a more favourable place to personality. The Aristotelian tradition is more to be trusted in its developing consequences for this subject than the Platonic, for dualism is above all the enemy of any true conception of personality. The inherent difficulties of interactionism and parallelism cannot be overcome from any dualistic point of view. In his concluding chapter Dr. Braham argues acutely and convincingly that personality cannot be conceived of in terms of mind only but essentially consists of body-mind in constant unified relationship. He shows, with special emphasis on Thomas Aquinas, that all the great thinkers of the past have supported this view, and many modern thinkers as well, such as Stout, McDougall, and Laird. The book concludes with a statement of the moral argument for immortality, which is based upon the view that a man cannot consistently and persistently lead a good life unless he is convinced that reality responds to his efforts.

In view of the approaching Quatercentenary of the English Reformation to be observed in 1938 various books have been and are to be published. Nothing can be more appropriate than a reissue of Moulton's *The History of the English Bible* (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net). This work, written by Dr. W. F. Moulton as far back as the seventies of last century, and characterized by that great scholar's learning and accuracy, passed through several editions, and was finally revised and extended in 1911 by his two sons, Dr. J. H. Moulton and the Rev. W. F. Moulton. This revised edition has now been abridged by Dr. A. F. Harrison. The abridgment is rather drastic, reducing the book to about half its size, but doubtless this has been done in the interests of a wider popularity. It gives the general reader a very fair and sufficient account of the history of the English Bible from the days of the early Saxon paraphrases down to the time of the Revised Version. Some note might have been added in regard to more recent versions which have attained a considerable degree of popularity, but as it is the book is packed full of first class material.

In *He Leadeth Me*, by the Rev. J. Brice, M.A. (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net), we have given to us a series of short devotional studies which appeared first in 'Joyful News.' They are written in a style that is simple and effective, and they deal with subjects which are vital to the culture and maintenance of the spiritual life. They are scriptural and evangelical, lit up here and there with apt illustrations.

To mark the fiftieth year since his own Ordination Dr. Herbert Hensley Henson, Bishop of Durham, has collected into a volume a number of the Charges (twelve in all) he has addressed to Ordination Candidates on the day before their Ordination, together with the Fourth Quadrennial Charge to the Clergy in his Diocese, and the Sermon he preached in Durham Cathedral on the fiftieth anniversary of his own Ordination. The volume is entitled *Ad Clerum* (Hodder and Stoughton; 5s. net). One cannot but admire these Ordination Charges not only for their simplicity and clarity and their mellow wisdom but also for their varied contents. Dr. Hensley Henson has not been tempted, or at least has not succumbed to the temptation, to harp only on one string. And they must have served their purpose well. We commend them to the notice of any to whom it falls to give similar Charges.

Evangelical conservatism is represented worthily in *Problems of Faith and Conduct*, by the Rev. W. S. Hooton, M.A., B.D., with a foreword by the Rev. J. Russell Howden, B.D. (Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions; 1s. net). The subjects dealt with are the Nature of the Gospel, Prayer, Modern Criticism, Prophecy and the Advent, The Limits of Controversy, and The Limits of Co-operation. The point of view is traditional, but the treatment is intelligent, and everywhere the writer reveals an honest and convinced sincerity. One point of great importance may be noted. Is it not a serious and dangerous error to bind the authority of Jesus to a particular view of Scripture?

The Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson, D.D., on his consecration as Bishop of Derby delivered certain addresses to the clergy of his diocese. These he has now published under the title of *The Church and the Challenge of To-day* (Longmans; 4s. 6d. net), and in doing so he has laid ministers and workers in all the churches under a debt. For these addresses are full of ripe wisdom and wise guidance. He emphasizes throughout the primary need of evangelism, and sees in the earnest prosecution of this work the best hope for spiritual unity among the churches. Other matters dealt with are Religious Education, Pastoral Methods, the Reserved Sacrament, and Christian Marriage. Every reader must be impressed with the fine Christian tone in which these subjects, some of them highly controversial, are here discussed.

Christian Morals, by the Very Rev. M. C. D'Arcy, S.J. (Longmans; 5s. net), is a timely book. Father D'Arcy is convinced that a statement and defence of fundamental principles of morality are overdue. There is a tendency to-day to base conduct on convenience and feeling, and this is due to ignorance of the deep, permanent realities that govern human welfare. The result of this tendency when embodied in practice is to identify certain Victorian conventions with the ancient morality itself, and the baby is thrown out with the bath water. This is specially true of some social distresses which we tend to sentimentalize instead of interpreting them by the sound laws of God.

In conducting his investigation of moral principles Father D'Arcy begins with the nature of human personality, and moves from that to the will of God for man, believing rightly that we must first understand what we are before we can find what is good or bad for us. The chapters of this book were originally broadcast talks; and the book includes additional chapters on such subjects as Pacifism, Marx, Moral Judgment, and The Spiritual Principle in Man.

Dr. R. H. Malden, Dean of Wells, has completed a series of lectures which was begun in 1935 with the Old Testament and continued in 1936 with the Deutero-Canonical books. They are published under the title, *The Authority of the New Testament* (Milford; 4s. 6d. net). The title may mislead; and a better title would be, 'The Nature and Contents of the New Testament.' It is the author's aim to sketch in popular terms the view of the New Testament which modern critical scholarship has established, and at the same time to point out that modern critical scholarship has not impaired the significance of the New Testament as the supreme and final authority in all matters relating to faith and morals. The author has succeeded well in his aim, showing himself, as in the previous volumes, a master of the art of popular exposition. The scope of the volume may be gathered from the main chapter headings, which are—(1) The Early Documents; (2) The Gospels; (3) The Canon and Inspiration; and (4) Christian Ethics.

The story of the Scottish Church in Italy and Malta is presented in *Beyond the Alps*, by the Rev. Albert G. Mackinnon, M.A., D.D. (Oliphants; 3s. 6d. net). It is a story of courage and faith that have been amply rewarded by the service they rendered to successive generations of Scottish people. All Presbyterians who have visited Rome will remember the little church in which for so long Dr. Gordon Gray ministered, and told the history of Rome to interested hearers, and also the hospitable home in which he and others have entertained wandering Scots. Both in Rome and Malta the Scottish Church cause has gone through many vicissitudes, but it has always had its place and its function, and has done justice to both. Dr. Mackinnon has himself played no small part in the story he has to tell, and for years has worthily upheld the honour and usefulness of the Scottish Church in Italy. There will be many readers for this interesting little volume.

The Student Christian Movement Press has published cheap editions, in paper covers, at 1s. each, of two series of broadcast talks which originally appeared in 1935. They are *The Way to God*, the speakers being the Rev. F. A. Iremonger, Dr. W. R. Matthews, and the Rev. J. S. Whale; and a second volume with the same title, the speakers being the Rev. C. C. Martindale, S.J., Dr. Raven, and the Rev. G. F. Macleod, D.D. The first volume deals with two topics: What is Man? and Does God Speak? The second has three topics: Jesus Christ, 'Yesterday, To-day and For Ever,' and Abundant Life. In their cheap form, these excellent talks ought to have a very wide circulation. It is one of the greatest reasons for thankfulness that the tone of broadcasting is so sound, and in particular that the religious side of it is being developed so wisely and so positively.

Old Texts in Modern Translations.

1 Corinthians i. 10 (Moffatt).

By Professor J. F. M'Fadyen, D.D., Serampore College, India.

'Brothers, for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ I beg of you all to drop these party-cries.' Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians gives a vivid picture of a Greek Church in its early days when the members were still wondering how far the new religion was going to lead them. For the most part they were men and women with no distinction of intellect or social status or birth; but they had the nimble wit of the Greek and the Greek love of discussion. As we read on, we can hear the Christian slave asking: 'If I am now a bond-servant of Jesus Christ, why must I remain in bondage to my human master?' Some were carrying to its logical conclusion Paul's contention that the death of Jesus had ended the dominion of the Law, including, as they claimed, the moral law. Christian women had begun to resent their subordination to men in a Church where, they were told, there was neither male nor female. There was keen competition as to which of the new spiritual gifts was to be regarded as most important. To their credit be it said that they were concerned about their new duties as well as their new privileges, and had begun to wonder how far their acceptance of hospitality was now restricted in a city in which so much of the meat consumed at table had first been sacrificed to some heathen deity and in which, as in modern India, invitations to festivals sometimes intimated that the function was to be held under the patronage of a 'god.' One wonders whether there is any modern parallel to a Church, composed for the most part of quite humble folks, realizing so keenly, in so short a space of time and in so many directions, the transforming power of the Christian religion.

The members of the Corinthian Church were discussing many problems: one problem they were not discussing, because they did not know it was a problem: the 'schisms' that were arising by the devotion of different groups to different party leaders. It is no accident that, immediately after the greeting and introduction, Paul plunges into this subject. To understand why to Paul these divisions seem so alarming, we have to keep in mind his teaching in the Epistle to the Ephesians; for it is reasonable to suppose that, at least in germ, probably in more developed form, Paul's thought on the relation of Jesus to world history was already formed. In the Epistle to the Ephesians, as Dr. E. F. Scott has said, 'Paul thinks of Christ as the central principle of existence. When he has gathered back to himself all the multitudinous strands which are now in confusion he will bring the world into harmony.' This work of creating harmony out of discord he accomplishes through His Church.

But what if the Church itself is torn into fragments, if the body of Christ through which he is to break down the barriers that separate men has itself erected barriers between its different groups? The Church has then become a house divided against itself, which cannot stand. There is treason in the very citadel of the Christian faith. No wonder Paul attacks the subject at once and devotes to it nearly one-fourth of the whole epistle. How many parties were there? 1^{12} seems to suggest that there were four: A Paul party, an Apollos party, a Cephas party, and a Christ party. At first sight one is tempted to accept the suggestion that 'I of Christ' is an indignant interjection of Paul himself; yet 2 Co 10^7 implies that then, or later, one or more members of the Church did make an unctuous claim to belong in a pre-eminent way to Christ; just as some modern missionary societies abjure all names but 'Christian' or 'Disciples,' the only result of their idealism being that they add one more to the already painfully large number of sects.

Whether the 'brother' singled out in 4^7 is the unnamed leader of another faction, and whether the ironical attack in the following verses is directed against his party or against the whole Church, is not clear. The point, and the only important point, was that the Church, through which Christ was to reunite the scattered fragments of the world, was itself divided into parties whose relation to each other was that of 'jealousy and strife' (3^3).

What had caused the divisions? All that has been written on the subject has given us little beyond more or less probable guesses. Dr. Denney tells of a sermon he once heard in which the preacher began by explaining that he had not had time to prepare a regular sermon and so would just give a simple gospel address! It was not a simple gospel in that sense that Paul proclaimed in Corinth, but it was a gospel that began and ended in the Cross of Christ. Or rather, Paul was making an abbreviation which risked misunderstanding when he said that 'among you I resolved to ignore everything but Jesus Christ and him crucified.' Surely Paul could not preach the gospel in Corinth, or anywhere else, without making clear that the Christ crucified was also the Christ risen. There were many other things about Christ and the Christian life that needed to be said. In the course of his correspondence with the Corinthian Church Paul found himself constrained by force of circumstances to say many of them. But, to begin with at least, in his Corinthan preaching, reacting perhaps from the comparative failure of his trial of another method in Athens, he resolved to concentrate on the foundation truth of the Christian religion, the Crucifixion of Christ. To Paul the Crucifixion was not just an important incident; it was *the* incident in the history of the world, the event which gives the key to the interpretation of the history of the universe. In making the Crucifixion central the combined witness of the four Gospels shows that Paul was in line with the testimony of practically the whole Church. The Crucifixion marked the end of an epoch, the end of the reign of law, the end of the dominion of Satan. It would have been more in accordance with the mind of Paul if the year of the Crucifixion rather than the year of the birth of Christ had been taken as the beginning of the Christian era.

In choosing the language in which to expound his gospel to the Corinthians Paul had but one aim: not to be clever or epigrammatic or flowery, but to be understood. One hopes Dr. Moffatt is correct in his translation, 'I never failed to make myself intelligible to you' (2 Co 11^{6}). We need not take too seriously the criticisms of Paul's power as a speaker made by members of the opposition at Corinth (2 Co 10^{10}, 11^{6}). It may be that Paul preached best on paper; but one whose public speech secured the results that Paul's undoubtedly did had no need to fear the unkindly comments of disgruntled Corinthians. Yet, in Corinth at least, Paul disdained all the arts of the orator and spoke with no thought of his own reputation but only to convict and convince. In all this Paul had his supporters: 'I of Paul.' Moreover, as he reminds the Church more than once, he was their 'father in God.' It was through him the gospel had been first brought to Corinth, and there would be those among his readers who would be loyal to the Apostle to whom they owed their very souls.

As for the Apollos party, the account given of Apollos in Ac $18^{24ff.}$ implies the writer's admiration for Apollos and none but the happiest relations between him and the circle to which Paul belonged. Nor is it quite necessary to assume that the leader whom Paul seems to be attacking in the passage beginning 1 Co 1^{17} and $2^{1ff.}$ is Apollos. Our suspicion that he is meant would be increased if we could accept the old translation 'eloquent' for the λόγιος of Ac 18^{24}, and it does not seem to be an impossible translation; while his Alexandrian training would strengthen the identification. One would have liked to hear the story from Apollos' point of view. At a time when the fierce criticism of Paul, that had developed before he wrote the concluding chapters of 2 Co, had apparently already begun (1 Co 4^{3}), Paul, who had the missionary's love for his first converts, would not be prejudiced in favour of a rival who now shared the position that he had once held alone. A man of Apollos' ability, learning, and zeal would recognize, as Paul himself recognized, that once the foundation had been laid, a superstructure must be built on it; and on the difficult moral problems that were arising in Corinth there was room for difference of opinion even among Christian leaders. Paul tried to evolve a Christian philosophy of history: Apollos may well have essayed the same task. At best Paul knew only at second-hand of the doings of Apollos, and he would naturally be perturbed if the reports that reached him of the popularity of his brilliant successor suggested that that popularity was gained at the expense of a distorted gospel.

At all events, whoever was responsible, Paul was persuaded that two mischievous things were happening in Corinth during his absence. The gospel was being advertised by means of rhetoric, 'the harlot of the arts.' Mr. Baldwin once had some strong things to say of the damaging effects in the political sphere of the meretricious use of certain dazzling phrases. Are they any less hurtful in the sphere of religion? In New Testament times men and women were saved by believing on the Lord Jesus Christ, crucified and risen. Salvation by moral maxim does not seem any more practicable in our time than it was then.

Paul believed also that the philosophy of the philosophers was being dragged into the service of the gospel, with ruinous results. To understand Paul's perturbation we must remember the close connexion that he saw (Ro 1 and Eph) between a pretentious godless philosophy and moral anarchy. He believed both that the speculations of conceited 'wise' men dimmed their perception of moral truth and that moral licence blinded men to spiritual truth. He is afraid that, on the foundation he has laid, superstructures are being built that will not stand the test of the Day, that the sanctuary of God is being destroyed; and in the later letter he definitely says that another Jesus is being proclaimed, a different Spirit, a different gospel.

In our day what Paul has to say about philosophy applies in an almost greater degree to science, or at least to the pronouncements of the scientist turned philosopher. Till lately we thought of science and philosophy as the preserve of a section of educated men. Now more or less accurate versions of at least the conclusions of scientists and philosophers are the property of the million. In the life of our day Paul would see a confirmation of his belief in the cause-and-effect relation between ungodly thinking and ungodly living. He makes it clear that his quarrel is not with philosophy, but with a philosophy that ignores the central fact in world history. The scientific method, we are told to-day, is the one method of reaching the truth about the world. The Cross of Christ, Paul would reply, is the one fact which, more than any other, illumines the meaning of the world and of history. Many a young Christian student must have realized vividly what Paul meant, when he entered a university and heard theories of the universe expounded by men who never seemed to have heard of Christ or His Crucifixion. 'Too good to be true' is the verdict with which Priestley dismisses the story of the incarnate Son of God crucified for the sins of the world; and many a 'thinker' of the day would not even pay it that tribute.

Paul has two tests for the validity of any version of the gospel, and the two tests are inseparable: Is it based on the crucified Christ? Has it power, that is, can it do things? One of the surprises of the time is the surprise with which many discover that the Christian religion is meant to do things and actually does them. Are we not to-day trying to separate the two? We are conscious of loss of 'power'; but are we not also conscious of a largely diminished regard for the Cross of Christ, which for Paul was the source and the only source of 'power'? Is it not time we thought out afresh our relation to the Cross and delivered ourselves from the anomaly of our present position? The Cross is still the symbol of the Church. It appears plentifully in our ecclesiastical architecture and as a personal adornment. In most sections of the Church much importance, in some sections very great importance, is attached to the celebration of the sacrament that commemorates the Crucifixion. But the preaching of the Cross, on the somewhat rare occasions when it is preached, meets a need that is no longer keenly felt. Is it possible to present a version of the Christian gospel which is not primarily the story of the crucified Christ? Paul at least would have said 'no.'

Of the Cephas party again, we have no actual knowledge. The one later reference which Paul makes to it adds nothing to our information. It is reasonable to suppose here that we have the earliest appearance of the theory which has played so prominent a part in Church history: that the descent of the spirit from person to person and from generation to generation must be accompanied by physical contact. Peter had been in the most intimate circle of the disciples of Jesus. Whether Paul had ever seen Jesus or heard Him we do not know. Paul made no secret of the fact that his first real contact with the followers of Jesus had been of a violently hostile nature, and that his first vital contact with Jesus was with the risen Christ. If Paul could have foreseen a time when the glorification of Peter would split not only the Corinthian Church but Christendom, he would have had more to say about it and it would have made interesting reading.

One of the sayings of Jesus that enshrines eternal truth is that in the Parable of the Tares and the Darnel: 'An enemy hath done this.' Even the gospel of Jesus Christ has hardly begun to permeate the world when men, most of them doubtless honestly believing that they are doing God service, are busy sowing weeds among the wheat. Gal, 1 Co and Col, to take only three examples, are largely occupied with Paul's resistance to perversions of the gospel which he believes to be deadly. One of his telling criticisms of those who uttered the party cries is that they exalt the teacher or the leader and correspondingly tend to dethrone Christ. Weymouth's translation may or may not be right in representing Paul as saying that he had deliberately abstained from the practice of baptism in Corinth in case converts would think they were being baptized into his name (1 Co 1$^{14f.}$). At all events he thanks God that he did abstain, a very remarkable utterance coming from the great pioneer missionary. The Spirit of God blows where it lists, and our ability to influence its movements is strictly limited, far more limited than we commonly allow. Paul says quite bluntly: 'The man who plants and the man who waters are ciphers. It is God that gives the harvest.' We can, we must, do the work that God has given us to do; but when we have done it we are but servants. We cannot have revivals when and where we will. The glorification of the leader takes two forms. When people are turning their backs on the Church, we ask ourselves: 'What is wrong with us?' a healthy question provided we remember that Paul and the Master Himself had their failures. When the harvest is abundant, we tend to say or at least to feel: 'To us be the glory.' One of the happiest features in the very striking mass movement in the diocese of the Bishop of Dornakal in South India is that the Bishop makes no claim to special piety or wisdom or zeal for the missionaries and the Christian forces of the diocese. It is, he says in the true Pauline spirit, the work of God.

How would Paul's teaching on party spirit apply to the divisions of our own day? Later in this epistle Paul is to give regulations for the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Into this celebration grave disorders had crept, but there is no hint that the members of the different parties could not all sit at the same Lord's Table. The recent Conferences in Oxford and Edinburgh have given one more proof that the conscience of the Church is seriously perturbed about our 'unhappy divisions,' but there is at times a certain vagueness about the reasons for calling our divisions unhappy. We sometimes find it difficult to join with much sincerity in the self-abasing confessions of sin on this subject to which we are from time to time invited. Why should we don sackcloth and ashes because some churches prefer a hierarchy while others prefer a more democratic form of government; because some churches baptize infants, while others think that baptism is only for those who have made a voluntary decision to live the Christian life; or because some churches prefer prescribed forms of worship which others believe to limit both freedom and spontaneity? To speak about such divisions rending the seamless robe of Christ seems a misuse of language. It might even be claimed that Christian liberty necessitates the tolerance of a certain variety in creed and forms of worship if not also of Church government.

But our divisions, if not necessarily shameful in themselves, may easily become shameful. In the judgment of many, when we cannot acknowledge as fellow-Christians those whom we know that Paul and our Lord Himself would acknowledge, there is cause for grave searching of heart. Our divisions, again, may well cause us shame if they lead to unseemly competition and rivalry. Fortunately, at least on the mission field, this century has seen an immense advance in the co-operation of churches and a rapid Christianizing of their relations to each other; though there are still missionary societies that prefer to plough their lone furrow or even to plough their neighbour's furrow. We may well feel ashamed also when our divisions partake in any degree of the nature of caste. In South India the Roman Church allows converts from Hinduism to carry with them into the Christian Church the caste distinctions they had as Hindus. (But there is no need to go to India for illustrations. In a village church in Scotland one has worshipped, or tried to worship, in a pew intended for the local shepherd and his family, a pew in which it was difficult to stand upright, while spacious galleries, some of them empty, were reserved for the lords of the manor and their retainers.)

Paul shows his usual Christian sagacity in dealing with the problem of the party cries. Christ, he says, is not divided. Differences of opinion of many kinds there will and must be among Christians; but none of them must be allowed to obscure our common devotion to our common Lord. He carries his praise of the Christians to the verge of flattery; for it is difficult to reconcile the testimony of 1^{7}: 'You come short in no charism,' with much in the rest of the epistle, and especially with the ironical outburst in 4$^{8\text{ff.}}$. But Paul is following the pedagogical maxim that criticism of failure must always be accompanied by recognition of achievement. Part of his rebuke is insinuated in the repeated use of the word 'brothers,' a word learned from the Master Himself. So long as Christians regard each other as members of one family, no difference of creed or worship can be an insurmountable barrier. Better unity of spirit with diversity of organization than a union in which there is no brotherly spirit.

In a compartmental church, whatever else may be said of it, there is always one notable cause of impoverishment. When the followers of Paul and Peter and Cephas are contending against each other, the partisans of each leader forget that the other leaders are also their possession. 'All things are yours, whether Paul or Apollos or Cephas.' This is one of the heaviest prices we pay for our Church divisions, that most of us are in so large measure ignorant of the history and the achievements of churches other than our own. Even when we do know them, we approach them, as it were, from the outside. All who have had experience of Church union know the intangible but very real difference there is between worshipping in a Church as an outsider and worshipping as a member of the family. Here is one contribution that the clergy of all churches can make towards the solution of the Church problem: to teach their people to know and appreciate, even to claim as their own, the saints and the spiritual inheritance of other churches.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Golden Eagle.

By the Reverend R. E. Thomas, M.A., Barnet.

'Swifter than eagles.'—2 S 1[23].

Not long ago, a magnificent engine stood in a siding at our station. It was the very latest thing in engines, *The Golden Eagle*. In fact, it was so new that it had not actually started to work. It is working now: it takes its train from London to Edinburgh in the record time of six hours.

Well, a great crowd of boys and girls, as well as a good many grown-ups, had gone to have a look at *The Golden Eagle*. We all admired its streamlined beauty, and we stood in amazement at the wonderful things we were told it could do. Then many of us went into the cab of the engine, which, as you know, is the place where the drivers and stokers are. The driver in charge told us all about things. He opened the furnace door and showed us the white-hot fire. He explained the various levers by which the engine is driven—he even let those who wished to sound the whistle, which is different from the whistles of ordinary engines and much more impressive. He explained to us how a great quantity of water could be picked up in an incredibly short time when travelling at full speed. And many other things.

It was all very interesting. But two things above all others struck me.

One was this: We were told how *The Golden Eagle* manages to travel its long journeys in such a short time. The reason is not that the engine races along on the level or downhill faster than other engines. It is that *The Golden Eagle* can go as fast, or almost as fast, uphill as downhill.

And here is the other specially interesting thing: 'That's the speedometer,' said the driver, pointing to a little box with a dial on top and needle to indicate the speed. We looked at the numbering on the dial, going up to a hundred miles an hour, or more. 'Ah,' said the driver, reading our thoughts, 'but it isn't all there. In that box underneath there is a pencil and paper, which also record the speed. You see,' he went on, 'if there were an accident they would want to know how fast we had been going; it would be no use our saying we were only doing fifty miles an hour if we were really doing ninety; the true speed would always be shown in black and white on the paper in the box.'

And now I am going to ask you to put those two things together. I want you to think, however, not of a railway engine, but of these lives of ours.

For one thing, the lives of real power are the lives which, like *The Golden Eagle*, can keep up speed uphill as well as downhill. It is easy to make a good show when all is level going, or when the track slopes downwards. The test comes when hills have to be climbed, difficulties met, obstacles faced, and strains taken. It is the life which can keep going with a good speed then which is the really strong life.

And one of the secrets of being able to do this is to be found in that second thing of special interest I mentioned. The drivers of *The Golden Eagle* know it would never be any use pretending that the speed of their engine was anything else than it actually was, because all the time the speed is being registered in black and white in the speedometer box. They know they must be quite honest about things. Now I do not say that *The Golden Eagle* keeps up its speed as well uphill as downhill because the drivers are honest men. But it is true that if we are to have lives of real power, which can keep going well even when the going is stiff and uphill work, we must first have lives which are honest through and through. It is no good pretending we are one thing when really we are another. We must remember that all the time there is that secret indicator writing its sure record of what we are and what we do. God desires 'truth in the inward parts.' Only lives which are true in that way will be really strong lives, equal to uphill as well as downhill tasks.

No Backbone.

By the Reverend Charles Dimond, Stalybridge.

'How then art thou turned into the degenerate?'—Jer 2[21].

Jeremiah was concerned because the Hebrews had turned away from God. He reminds them that at the beginning God had started them on the right way of life, but they had lost it and had gone astray. Thinking of them as a people who in the beginning might be compared to a true vine, he asks—'how then art thou turned into the degenerate plant of a strange vine?'

The force of this question came to me after one of my holidays. During a visit to Cullercoats on the coast of Northumberland, I went into the Marine Aquarium at the foot of the cliff facing the harbour. In one room there were tanks full of all kinds of fishes—herring, codling, plaice, and many others; some of them having exceedingly beautiful colours. As you looked at them through the glass windows in the sides of the tanks, some of the fishes came and stared back at you. In another room were a lot of stone tanks constantly fed with a running stream of fresh sea water, in which various creatures were living—crabs, lobsters, sea anemones, and many other things. A label above one of these tanks stated something like the following:

> 'Creatures which start life with the elements of a backbone, but after the early stages, settle down to a sedentary life and lose all trace of this.'

At once these funny little creatures about four inches in height became full of interest. The more I studied them the more interesting they became. That is usually so with all our studies, whatever they may be, physics, chemistry, French, and even maths. These funny little things[1] begin life with a spinal cord, a tail, a brain, a heart, and an eye. They start life with great promise, full of wonderful possibilities; having a backbone, a tail something like that of a large tadpole which enables them to swim about, a brain that ought to develop usefully, and an eye they ought to keep and use. But—they settle down! They lose their tails and cannot swim; all trace of the backbone goes; the brain shrivels up until it is nothing but a tiny hard useless lump; the eye disappears and they cannot see. There they were, degenerate little creatures, stuck to the rock, unable to think, see, swim or move, and with no backbone.

How terribly lazy they must have been to settle down so miserably, losing so many abilities and finally all backbone! It is so pitiable too, when through sheer laziness, the evasion of all effort, the despising of all encouragement to learn and develop, boys and girls degenerate as they grow older.

The brain is given us to use, not to neglect. By using our brain, it can be developed and its powers increased. Some learned folk tell us that our powers of memory are fixed when we are born. But it is a firmly established fact to-day that the memory can be definitely improved by training. We all have visions and ambitions in our early years. Every boy dreams of being an important person some day. Most girls dream of a wonderful home that they hope to possess sometime in the years to come. But these visions of a better future are so easily lost as the passing years increase in number, unless—to quote a writer you may some day enjoy reading, George Meredith—we 'plod on and keep the passion fresh.' Never let your ideals and your high hopes perish; cherish them all the way through life. As an eminent physician once said to a youth in my presence—'always be aiming at something higher than you have ever yet attained.' A ministerial friend of mine told me that he always came out top in the Greek exams at college, because the monitor always posted the results on the notice board upside down! But that never discouraged him. He persevered, and to-day he is a most acceptable minister of the gospel, loved and respected by all who know him. But I know a man who used to be the secretary of a large Sunday School in his younger days. He was full of enthusiasm, ideals, hopes, and energy. Then a time came when he was able to buy a comfortable home in the suburbs of a great city, and he settled down in that. Later he bought a comfortable little motor car, and he settled down in that. He gave up his seat in the church; resigned his secretaryship of the Sunday School; lost all his ideals, his vision, his hopes, his energy. He settled down and became a comparatively useless fellow, stuck to the rock of his comfortable and cosy little home.

One of the saddest things that is ever said about a man is that he has not fulfilled the promise of his early years. That, in a sentence, is the whole story of those curious little creatures in the tank. They settled down and lost their vision, their powers, and their backbone.

The Christian Year.

TWENTY-FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Values of Jesus.

'The kingdom of heaven is like unto a merchant man, seeking goodly pearls: who, when he had found one pearl of great price, went and sold all that he had, and bought it.'—Mt 13^{45f}.

If we are anxious to consider the various ideas under which the true life may be summarized, we are bound to come, sooner or later, to the idea of life as a discovery. Life is a search. Both in the Old and New Testament there is a great deal said about seeking. Old Testament worthies were commended because, like Ezra, they prepared their hearts to seek the Law. The author of Ecclesiastes declares that he gave his heart to search and seek out wisdom. In the Psalms again and again there is expressed that noble desire, 'O God, thou art my God; early will I seek thee.' In the teaching of the Lord Jesus we cannot ignore the definite injunction to seek first the Kingdom of God. And in one of His pictorial passages our Lord declared that the Kingdom of Heaven could be thought of in terms of a search. It was, He said, 'like a merchant seeking goodly pearls.'

---

[1] Ascidians—Ciona.

Much of the success and happiness that come to us depends on the attitude we adopt to life itself. In this, as in most things, we differ greatly one from another. Charles Dickens's father was easy tempered and improvident. He had a very hopeful disposition that things would turn out all right. They didn't turn out all right, and Dickens senior was arrested for debt and sent to the Marshalsea prison. Possibly it was with this in mind that Charles Dickens immortalized Micawber, who always hoped that something would 'turn up' to lift him out of his difficulties. Micawber has many followers to-day. There are men and women, even young men and women, who are always prepared to take the line of least resistance, to wait peaceably until something happens to their advantage.

But many of life's greatest values lie hidden from our gaze. Gold is not found casually by the wayside. If it were, it would cease to have much value. And the world owes a great debt to those who go through life searching for its treasures. They pursue their search very often in the most unlikely places. There is a district south of Palestine, the Sinai peninsula, a place of sweltering valleys and iron mountains. To look at it one would never imagine that it contained anything of value. But strangely enough it has always been one of the treasure-houses of the world. In the olden days the Egyptians, we are told, used to come here in search of turquoise and malachite and copper ore. And in the nineteenth century in this unlikely district there was discovered by Dr. Tischendorf one of the world's great treasures—a codex of the Bible dating from the fourth century.

There is hardly a department of investigation which does not yield similar stories. And, to go into other realms, what tremendous truths about human nature have been at last laid bare through the energy of scientists. A short time ago an eminent scientist reminded us of Harvey's epoch-making discovery of the circulation of the blood. The way of knowledge has never been easy to travel. Pioneers have had to endure ridicule and even persecution . . . but they believed in the value of their quest. There is hardly anything in our modern world which we do not owe to the enthusiasm of the seeker.

The same principle holds true of the life of the soul. There is no way of attaining the serene heights of noble character except by climbing. The Transfiguration was on the mount, not on the plain. Life's deepest harmonies are not heard unless we attune our ears to them. One does not stumble upon the City of God; it is only found by those who seek; and the rich treasures of Christ are only theirs who deliberately set themselves to cultivate His fellowship. Masefield has well expressed this essential attitude of the noble soul.

We travel the dusty road till the light of the day is dim,
And sunset shows us spires away on the world's rim.

We travel from dawn to dusk, till the day is past and by,
Seeking the Holy City beyond the rim of the sky.

But if many of life's true values lie hidden from the casual gaze, it is equally true that they can be found. Masefield does not appear to have always avoided pessimism. He sings:

Not for us are content, and quiet, and peace of mind,
For we go seeking a city that we shall never find.

There is no solace on earth for us—for such as we—
Who search for a hidden city that we shall never see.

There is a despairing tendency in such lines which hardly accords with that greater word in the Gospel, 'Seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you.'

It would not be psychologically possible for normal people to go on seeking unless they felt sure that ultimately they would find. A universe where that were possible would be disordered and capricious. It would not be the universe wherein is expressed the goodness of God. Jesus did not dangle before men pleasant but unattainable delights. He knew, none better, that human peace and happiness depend on our finding certain things. It was His mission to help us to find them. They can be found.

Can a man who has fallen by the way rise again, and find again his true place in life? Can a mother, sorely stricken in the hour of bereavement, find again the joy she had lost through the death of her child? Can a sinner who has turned his back on God look again into God's face and find tenderness there?

These are not idle queries. When we come to the level of our common life we discover that these are the real things men are anxious to find. The most anxious searches in which men engage are not those for diamonds and gold and fame. They are searches for peace of mind, assurance of forgiveness, certainty about the life to come. These are the values that men need most.

The true values of life, thus possible of attainment, are attained only at a price, and by an effort. 'For that one pearl,' the merchant said, 'I would give everything.'

One of the troubles of our day is that so many expect to receive the pearl without making any definite effort toward it. This may be due to the fact that this generation has inherited so much from the past. Our fathers have done so much for us. It is their devotion, and often sacrifice, which opened many of the avenues along which now we travel. In nearly every realm they fought their battles for education, for freedom in worship, for better conditions of life, and all that most of us have had to do is step in and enjoy the advantages.

So it is true of a great many to-day that they are very ready to receive, but extremely slow to give; willing to accept the many advantages handed down from other generations, but reluctant to face the important task of creating a better world for generations to come. The attaining of life's great treasures, said Jesus through His parable, depends at least on two factors. We need a great desire for the pearl of life, and we need that spirit which will bend every effort to secure it.

Such a lesson is not without point for the modern Church. It is all to the good that we occasionally remind ourselves that the Kingdom of God is something most desirable. Long ago Jesus saw in vision the time when men and women would come from every quarter of the globe to form the true fellowship of God's Kingdom. Have we lost that vision? Does the ideal of Jesus for the world still come to us with the appeal it had in earlier days? Again and again we need to say to ourselves, 'amid the varied treasures which this world offers, nothing can equal in value the supremacy of Christ's ideals. This is the great objective before which all else is secondary.' If the ideals of Jesus are worth while, surely there is no effort we will not make that His Kingdom may be established among men. We may feel it to be an effort, in the economic stress of modern life, to preserve our Christian standards, but the welfare of the world demands that we do adhere both in letter and spirit to the higher way. We may feel it a temptation, when so many ignore Sunday to join the pleasure-loving throng. But the spiritual life of our nation demands that at all costs we keep burning the flame upon the altar. Often we may have felt like giving up the struggle for personal piety, the cultivation of the nobler powers of the soul. But that struggle may never be relinquished.

What are we willing to be and to do for the sake of those great values which Jesus placed before men?[1]

SUNDAY NEXT BEFORE ADVENT.

The Danger of Comparison.

'Who is left among you that saw this house in its former glory? and how do ye see it now? is it not in your eyes as nothing? . . . saith the Lord of hosts. The latter glory of this house shall be greater than the former.'—Hag $2^{3.9}$ (R.V.).

These discouraging old men who could recall what the former Temple was like before the sack and destruction of Jerusalem had really something to say for themselves. It is easy to talk of restoring the past, but above a certain level of quality, is restoration really possible? The Temple as it had been was glorious not merely with the lavish wealth of Solomon but with objects which in their nature could not be replaced. The ark was there and the Mercy-seat, and the cherubim. According to steadfast tradition the tables of stone had been there, and the pot of manna, and Aaron's rod—things all of pure miracle, which the most cunning craftsman could never reproduce. Some poor imitations might be furnished, but the magic of association would be absent.

So they might and so they did affirm, with a clear show of truth, yet essentially theirs was an ungodly opinion. Those objects whose loss they mourned—the ark, the manna, the tables of stone—were nothing more than tokens and reminders of the activity of God, and surely He might discover other memorials of His presence; but of this the old men had no thought. Since they were tired and done, their one contribution was to damp the enthusiasm of those who were making a great adventure. Such depressed and timorous souls are likely always to forget three great certainties of faith—that since God is alive He may repeat Himself, doing again what He once has done: that since God is a Spirit—most high, most free—He may not repeat Himself, but may find other ways of working: and that since God is Almighty, He may exceed Himself, so that the greatest amazements may be still in store.

---

[1] F. Townley Lord, *Christ on the Road*, 121.

1. If God is alive *He surely may repeat Himself*: what He has done He is able to do again. There was a group of famous English writers who systematically made use of history to explore the nakedness of the present. 'We are selfish men,' cries Wordsworth, and he calls upon Milton to 'return to us again, and give us manners, virtue, freedom, power,' as if these had all become glories of the past. Ruskin found his standard of civic life and law in old Venice; Froude saw manhood and capacity complete in the England of Elizabeth, and pointed with scorn to the increasing degradation of to-day.

But the right study of history gives us measures not only for judging the present but for pitching our expectations with regard to the future. It exhibits the life and the thoughts of God passing into men and raising them above themselves to sudden clearness of view and nobility of action. It shows how from obscure beginnings movements have been guided to the very grandest issues, and thus it admonishes us not to despise the day of small things. We may criticise performance as we will and thus urge men on to do better, but we must never disparage possibility, for that is God's part.

If we look too curiously at the human actors it is easy for us to lose heart. We measure ourselves in stature against the men of old and feel like pygmies walking between the legs of a giant race. Yet these big men prospered largely because they did not think about their own dimensions; a work was waiting to be done, and, putting their hand to it, they grew great with the greatness of their task. This Temple of Solomon had once itself seemed altogether too poor and narrow for its purpose. 'Will God indeed dwell upon the earth?' was the cry of its builder: 'behold the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee, how much less this house which I have builded!' So it was not Solomon but God who gave that house its glory. And this God is our God, who ever liveth, and who only doeth wondrous things.

2. These men forgot that *God* who is spirit *may not repeat Himself*. They fancied that there was only one way in which God's House could be worthy of Him, and as they recalled the many details of adornment which could not be replaced they already in their hearts accepted failure. Their dream was of an exact restoration, a Temple such as it used to be; but God is always changing the world, and thus He makes any slavish attitude to the past unseemly. It is not only hard, it is impossible to repeat the achievements, and exactly to renew the forms, of other days; but God is always making new things, and He intends us to do the work of to-day in such fashion as the times allow. He calls children into a world different from that which their fathers knew, and of each He then requires a service which is his own. Of the innumerable queer things in Nature George Herbert says:

To show Thou art not bound, as if Thy lot
Were worse than ours, sometimes *Thou shiftest hands*.

Augustine by thought and study and prayer seeks to touch God, mind to mind, which, surely, is a glorious ambition in life. But then comes Francis, with a laugh and a song and a benediction for every living creature. He has no keen interest in books or thought, but through him a host of tired and hopeless creatures in Italy got a vision of Jesus Christ. That, certainly, was also a life in God. Yet neither Augustine nor Francis knew what Luther knew of that loving sentence of pardon by which God separates a man—and for ever—from his past of guilt. Thus in age after age we see God fulfilling Himself in many ways; and we sin against Him and against ourselves when we refuse to recognize His grace and power except on lines which have become familiar. That is a kind of idolatry, and to many of the Jews Solomon's Temple was as much an idol as any god of wood or stone, for to them it seemed absolutely to match God's greatness that no departure from it in any single point could be allowed.

Should we not give thanks for this continual change which keeps our spirits fresh, and exercises our faculty in following Him as in many parts and in many ways He reveals Himself. The peculiar distinction of Solomon's Temple had lain in the gorgeousness of its array, but now a plainer house was rising, the love-gift of a poor people, and this fact also might lend it beauty. If they had known, that plainness marked a stage in the progress towards Jesus—God's Living Temple, where material glitter was wholly lacking, and the majesty lay in the spirit.

Our God dwells not in a Temple which stands unchanging throughout the generations, but in a living house which is continually being builded by new men, and which always calls for other kinds of service. What is asked of us is that, putting God first, we should bring the offering of our best to Him who is ever making new things.

3. But there is another stage: these old men were forgetting that *God, Who is Almighty, may exceed Himself*. So long as God lives we may

confidently expect things which eye has not seen nor ear heard. This blunt, ungifted, old prophet, unabashed by the surface look of things, doggedly declared that the glory of His latter house was to be greater than the former. When the Baptist for a while had dazzled the eyes of his contemporaries, Jesus, who acknowledged all John's greatness, yet declared that 'he who is but little in the Kingdom of God is greater than he.' You must not dream, said Jesus, that even the Baptist is God's last word of help; and, in harmony with this, He continually pointed forwards. On the night before our Lord suffered He declared, 'He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do, because I go unto my father.' That is a lesson which we greatly need to learn: our business is not only with the past, we have to welcome glories on their way.

Those who live near God are conscious that they are always within a step of undreamed-of glories of change. They have seen how a single word from God may transfigure a whole life; how, finding a man hopeless and forlorn, it may flood his heart with enduring sunshine; and, having seen this, they know that where God is all things are possible.[1]

First Sunday in Advent.

The Love of God.

'For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son.'—Jn 3^{16}.

Beyond this message we cannot go. There is no higher conception of God, and there is no conception that so grips the heart of man. It is so simple that a child can feel the uplift and the charm, so deep that the saint dies with these unfathomed words on his lips.

The casual reader of the New Testament feels, as he reads the words, 'For God so loved the world,' that these are not an exact report of the words of Jesus. There is the atmosphere of the Johannine vocabulary about them. If that be so, is it not a greater tribute that Jesus was such, that one of the men who had come under the influence of His life and of His teaching could conceive such words and express therein such a knowledge of God? What a power, what a beauty, what winsomeness there must have been about the Jesus of History!

If we lost the whole of the New Testament save these words, great would be our loss, yet in this verse we should have the Alpha and the Omega of the gospel. From these words as from a fountain we should find all the necessary knowledge of God, of man, of sin, of salvation, and of the importance of this life and its abiding issues.

The Parable of the Prodigal Son, the Parable of the Two Debtors who could not pay and whose creditor forgave them, are pictures of this verse, a bodying forth in the form of a story of the theology and the philosophy contained in the verse. God gives His only begotten Son as Saviour, not as Judge.

The life of Jesus is this verse in action, such action as has altered the face of the earth, and is slowly altering the very heart and hopes and aims of man. 'God so loved the world' is the keynote of that Life which gave itself up for the sheep. He prayed for His very murderers.

God did not make the world and then go away, as St. Augustine reminds us. He made the world and then gave His only begotten Son to redeem and reconcile the children of men. This love of God is the key which gives meaning to His life. Without it, that life would still have been a life of beauty and a joy for ever, but it would not have been our salvation from sin.[2]

1. Love is always self-imparting. That is its very nature and characteristic—it gives. *Love proves itself in giving.* A love that never poured itself out in lavish giving could scarcely be reckoned to be love at all. Well, God's love proved itself by His gift. 'God so loved . . . that he gave.' And what a gift it was! 'He gave his only begotten Son.' Some commentators on this verse draw a distinction between what God did in the case of the prophets and what He did in the case of Jesus. God *sent* John the Baptist, but He *gave* His Son. Giving is at once a more complete thing than sending. You may send a thing and withdraw it. But when you give there is no withdrawal. Well, God gave His Son. He did not merely send Him, to call Him back again should His mission fail. He 'gave Him,' entirely, absolutely, unreservedly. He delivered Him up to death for us all. And giving is also a more costly thing. Sending need not make much demand upon us, but giving suggests personal sacrifice and loss. And God could not prove His love and save our world by the easy process of sending, but only by the costly and sacrificial process of giving. And the greatness of His love is revealed in the gift He gave. 'God so loved that he gave his only begotten Son.'

Dr. Cynddylan Jones in a book of *Studies in St. John*, writing on this verse, says that the gospel has introduced a new kind of arithmetic, which estimates love not by what is given but by what is left *after* giving. 'She hath given more than they all,' said our Lord about the widow and her two mites. But how did He make that out?—for many had cast large gifts into the Treasury that day. He got at it in this way. He reckoned not by what was given, but by what was left after giving.

---

[1] W. M. Macgregor, *Christ and the Church*, 210.

[2] A. Hird, *The Test of Discipleship*, 108.

And if we apply the same kind of arithmetic to the giving of God, then when He gave His Son He gave the greatest gift even the Infinite God could give. For when He gave Jesus, He had no Son left. He gave all He had, even all His living. But fully to realize the content of that phrase, '*so* loved,' we must remember to what it was God gave Him. He gave Him up to rejection and shame and death. He gave Him to be numbered among the transgressors. He gave Him to be esteemed of men as stricken, smitten of God and afflicted. God knew that in no cheaper way could our redemption be effected, so in the depth and passion of His love He gave Him up for us all.

2. The text not only gives proof of the love of God but it speaks also of *the scope of His love.* 'God so loved the *world*.' It is a universal love. That word 'world' in the New Testament signifies 'humanity as alienated from God'—God loved the world with every soul in it.

It is universal to begin with *in its extent.* The love of God is not localized or limited. It is not confined within racial or national boundaries. The Jews believed that the love of God was limited to their own nationality. They were God's children and all the rest were aliens and outcasts. But our Lord repudiated the limits the Jews would thus have set upon the love of God. 'Other sheep I have,' He said, 'which are not of this fold, them also I must bring'—and for those other sheep He gave His life. 'Go into all the world,' was His parting command to His disciples, 'and preach the gospel to the whole creation.' God carried the world on His heart and every soul in it was dear to Him. Here is the nerve of the missionary enterprise—the cannibal of New Guinea, the primitive and half savage folk of Central Africa, they are all embraced in the love of God and for them Christ died.

Then this love is universal *in its reach.* God so loved the world. It is not only that all peoples are embraced in it, but all conditions of people are embraced in it as well.

There are no limitations to this love. People have tried to put limits to it. Christian people have tried to put limits to it—they talked of a limited atonement and they preached a love which was confined to the elect.

The world embraces us all; *whosoever* means everybody, anybody. We remember the remark Richard Baxter made about this verse. 'If it had read "There is mercy for Richard Baxter" or "God loved Richard Baxter," I am so vile, so sinful, that I would have thought it must have meant some other Richard Baxter. But these words "the world" and "whosoever" include the worst of all Baxters that ever lived.'

3. And the other things about the love of God which our text reveals is *its purpose and design.* 'God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life.' First on its negative side. Man is in the position of those bitten Israelites of whom Jesus had spoken to Nicodemus in the conversation which the Evangelist has just recorded. He has got the poison of sin into his system. The virus is in the blood. It is obviously working out its deadly effects upon him. The blighted lives, the broken characters, the defiled souls of men, the loss of honour, purity, aspiration, truth, all proclaim that the wages of sin is death. And that was God's design in sending His Son—to deliver men from the death of sin.

But Salvation is not negative simply, it is positive also. Salvation is not the same thing as *salvage.* A vessel is found in mid-Atlantic, battered and dismantled, and is towed by another vessel into the safety of some harbour. That is *salvage.* But the vessel thus rescued is a poor and shattered hulk. *Salvation* is much more than that. If we may continue the nautical figure—it is the restoration of that battered hulk into all its original strength and grace and beauty of line. 'Should not perish'! He saves us from death. That is salvage. But that is only half the story. 'Have eternal life.' That is Salvation. It is a new quality of life we get from Christ—a life which death cannot touch and which sin cannot stain because it is the life of God in the soul. That is what Salvation means—not escape from some future hell, but eternal life, here and now.[1]

I am not skilled to understand
What God hath willed, what God hath planned;
I only know at His right hand
  Stands One who is my Saviour.

That He should leave His place on high
And come for sinful man to die,
You count it strange? So do not I,
  Since I have known my Saviour.

---

[1] J. D. Jones, *Morning and Evening*, 92.

Yea, living, dying, let me bring
My strength, my solace, from this spring,
That He who lives to be my King
Once died to be my Saviour.

One man, as he was drawing away from earth, was heard to repeat these words again and again: 'God so loved the world . . . so loved the world. . . .' Then, ere he drew his last breath, he said earnestly, 'God so loved the world . . . Oh! men do not know it. I must return to tell them, to *make* them understand.'

Second Sunday in Advent.

His Offer of Himself as Adequate Resources.

'Lo, I am with you alway.'—Mt 28^{20}.

Our theme here is the living presence of Christ as a force in the life of the believer and of the Church. 'Go ye therefore, and teach all nations . . . and lo, I am with you alway.' It should be clearly observed that the Presence is indissolubly linked to the obligation. The endowment and the task are intertwined. The equipment and world evangelism must not be separated. If the Presence is sought apart from the task, if the higher friendship is cultivated apart from obedience to the divine will, we shall miserably fail in our quest. On the other hand, if we seek to pursue the adventure of evangelism apart from the reinforcement which the Presence supplies, we shall be overwhelmed by the magnitude of the task. Our only guarantee of success lies in our vital relation to the Presence. Possessing Christ, the Church holds resources that are level to every contingency.

We shall possess, to begin with, *companionship in the midst of loneliness*. And the Christian needs this reinforcement. But the major portion of his life is lived in secret. His struggles with himself, with his temptations; his doubts, and fears, must be fought out in the lonely fastnesses of his soul. The vocation of the Christian also inevitably leads him into spheres of loneliness. Not infrequently he must confront an indifferent, and even hostile, environment. He must cherish and proclaim ideals of life and conduct that are challenging and distasteful to others. This loneliness is bound up with the nature of his vocation.

In 1920 there passed away Mrs. Christina Forsyth, an heroic servant of Christ, who was described as the loneliest woman in the world. For thirty years she lived and laboured amidst the dark-skinned natives of Africa. Between them a great gulf was fixed, in the matter of language, habits, tastes, and ideals. Some one once ventured to commiserate her on her lot, and this was her reply. 'All these years I have never once been alone, for I have always been conscious of the presence of Jesus.'

That was also the experience of the early apostles. They lived continually in the fellowship of the Presence. They never speak of Jesus, as they spoke of the prophets. They never talk of Him, as though He belonged to the past. They sometimes speak of Him as belonging to the future. But pre-eminently He is their great Contemporary. One of Paul's phrases is 'The Lord stood with me.'

Again if Christ is with us alway, we have the guarantee of *guidance in the midst of perplexity*. Life is a labyrinth, a tangle, a maze of alternative ways, where it is difficult to choose aright.

Sir Ernest Shackleton once found himself amid the snow and ice of the frozen South, with ship destroyed, and his men marooned. With two companions he set out in search of help. As they moved forward over unknown mountains and slippery glaciers, their venture seemed utterly hopeless. But they earnestly prayed for divine guidance, and they received it. They discovered that they were not three but four. 'Boss,' said Worsley, 'I had a curious feeling that there was another person with us.' And Shackleton said, 'So had I.'

Consider the need of these early Christians. They were setting out on the biggest adventure of their lives. They had no rules or precedents to guide them. They had a new Church to create: what was to be the structure of its organization? They had a new gospel to preach: how were they to interpret and apply it? They had a new world to conquer: what routes would they follow? They had new leaders to find: whom would they choose? They were undertaking a new enterprise: what method and what weapons would they employ? Everything was new, untried, experimental. Their primary need was guidance. Yet they went forward in faith and hope, believing that guidance would be forthcoming. And they were not disappointed. The whole history of the Apostolical venture is the bracing record of a Spirit-guided and a Spirit-controlled Church.

Once again, we are promised *fortitude in the midst of trial and suffering*. Sometimes the Christian life is construed as a soft option. It is presented as a way of escape from the rude shocks of life. It is a way of keeping out of trouble. It might more reasonably be presented as a way of getting into trouble. That, at any rate, was the experience of the Apostolic Church. The flaming ideals of the Church challenge man's easy-going complacency. Its redemptive programme cuts clean athwart the aspirations of the world. So the impact of the gospel on the world is like the meeting-place of wind and tide. There is turbulence and confusion and trouble. Jesus never expected anything else. He said, 'In the world ye shall have tribulation.' What He promised them was not freedom *from* trouble but His presence *in* trouble. 'When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee.' 'Go ye . . . and lo, I am with you alway.'

What nameless strength and promise of endurance are folded in that quiet, strong promise: 'What is the secret of your beautiful life?' some one asked Kingsley; and he replied, 'I had a friend.'

Finally, this promise is our guarantee of *adequate resources for fulfilling the obligations of our Christian calling*. This indeed is the strictly textual significance of the passage. Our Risen Lord was commissioning His disciples and sending them forth on the greatest and loveliest adventure of their lives.

Consider for a moment the magnitude of the task that their Master put upon their shoulders. Their business was to overcome the intractable prejudices of their fellow countrymen and cleave a passage through the vested interests of ancient heathen superstitions. They had to build bridges across the yawning gulfs that separated Jew from Gentile, bond from free, male from female. Their task was to turn the world upside down, because it was wrongside up. It should be noticed that the programme of Christ was concerned 'with the agenda rather than the credenda of the faith.' 'Go ye and teach them to *observe all things* whatsoever I have commanded you.' It was with the world's manner of life rather than with its views that the disciples primarily must concern themselves. And every one knows that it is an infinitely harder task to change men's lives than to alter their ideas. Yet that was the task Christ set them to do, and for this superhuman undertaking they were furnished with no resources except such as the Presence yielded.

The testimony of the Early Church was that those resources were adequate. Dr. Gossip tells that when the British soldiers landed in France at the beginning of the Great War, they went through villages and townships of France shouting 'Hip, hip, Hurrah.' The natives optimistically understood them to say, 'Il pourra.' 'He will see it through.' That may be a legend, but this is no legend that the Early Church marched, with banners flying, to the strain of that music.

One is impressed in the New Testament with the total absence of the word 'problem.' The Early Church was blind to its problems, because its eyes were dazzled with the splendour of its resources. To be sure these Christians had problems and to spare, but they pitted their own resourcelessness against their divine resources, and they were well content to leave the matter there. Nothing can be more impressive than the sense of adequacy and even of opulence which marked all their lives. They were sitting on the top of things, and the world was at their feet, 'I have a sufficiency of all things,' said one of them. 'In Christ Jesus I have all things and abound.' 'In Him who strengtheneth me I am equal to anything.' The Presence brought to them the fullness of God, and what more could they need or want?

Do we not need to recover this Apostolical accent in the life of the modern Church? Our Church consciousness to-day is clouded over with the problem-complex. We are beset by problems: the problems of the faith, of Church life, of the social order, of the international order. It is a bewildering chaos. And to our Christian life the same criticism applies. We are more acutely conscious of our loneliness than of the presence of the Divine Companion. We stress our perplexities, and forget our Guide. We are overwhelmed with our sufferings, and fail to catch the gentle accents of the Comforter Divine. We groan under our responsibilities, and the burden of our tasks, and ignore the presence of the Strengthener. We see the bane, but we are blind to the antidote. We emphasize our poverty, we forget our riches. We know our task, we are ignorant of our resources. Religion is to us, what it should never be, weights; instead of being, what it should be, wings. Our sorest need is to recover the Apostolic emphasis.

When Charles VIII. demanded ransom of the city of Florence, the Mayor, Capponi, refused to give a groat. Charles thundered threats. 'I will have my trumpets blown!' he shouted, with gleaming eyes. 'Blow your trumpets,' replied Capponi, 'Blow your trumpets and we will ring our bells.' At this threat Charles was silent, for he knew that at the ringing of the bells the hidden armies of Florence would spring into action.

Is the time not overdue for the Church to cease concentrating on its problems and to begin to possess and enjoy and use its resources? For the simple truth is, that faith in the Risen and ever present Christ puts at our disposal all the invisible and invincible legions of heaven.[1]

---

[1] R. Menzies, *The Magnet of the Heart*, 189.

THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

Subduing Cynicism.

By the Reverend Leigh Waller, B.A., Bridgwater.

'Give not that which is holy unto the dogs.—Mt 7[6].

This saying stands somewhat disjointedly in the setting of the Sermon on the Mount; we cannot, without undue strain, weave it into its immediate context. Matthew is the only writer who records it.

Yet it is certainly congruous with the attitude of Jesus. We must be struck by the reverent spirit of His living. Not only does He show it in the attachment He had for the synagogue, attending its worship each Sabbath, and in a love of the Temple that made him go to the audacious extreme of driving out the money-changers from its precincts, but there is an attitude of reverence pervading His life. It was due to His discernment of the presence and care of God, the Father. This characteristic reverence was an awareness of God's power; to Him the world was alive with the Father's presence.

Jesus trained His disciples in the same attitude. The closer relationship between man and God that He taught enriched the meaning of the sacred moments in life. At the same time, of course, it increased responsibility for preserving what was sacred. No longer was the sense of the holy, the experience of life's most intimate contacts with God to be mediated by a privileged priesthood. The Holy of Holies was thrown open, though not to the inquisitive and the irreligious, to all reverently minded disciples.

Formerly the priesthood was the sole custodian of holy things; it watched over and preserved the sacred temple properties and also the sacred occasions of worship. Religion belonged to a group rather than to individuals; the priesthood dealt in holy things as representative of the group. Even for Ezekiel, who seems more prophet than priest and who suggests an understanding of personal religion, the ideal state that Israel may become includes a priesthood to 'teach my people the difference between the holy and the common.'

Jesus broadens the vision and makes every follower a custodian of the mysteries of religion. He teaches a high view of life; a lofty responsibility for reverence.

At the heart of all religion, we are told, there is a core of wonder, a sense of mystery, an idea of the holy. It is present no less in personal than in priestly religion. Jesus makes His followers responsible for maintaining an attitude of reverence and for opposing the shallow view that sees life as something sordid.

Life goes on a dreary way for a time, and then suddenly there is a divine uplifting of the commonplace, a crowded moment of experience from which all that is ugly, untrue, or immoral is purged. There are treasurable times in life, sacred with a vision of God.

> I am a little child, and I
>   Am ignorant and weak;
> I gaze into the starry sky
>   And then I cannot speak;
>
> For all behind the starry sky,
>   Behind the world so broad,
> Behind men's hearts and souls doth lie
>   The infinite of God.

There are moments when we discern the infinite of God. They may be moments in prayer; in church worship or private devotion; they may be moments when even in the presence of pain and bitterness we feel the finger of God on our lives. Perhaps the time comes when we are facing the loveliness of natural beauty, or in personal relationships: the presence of children, the conversation of friends. There is a rich variety of holy occasions.

'Mysticism,' says the critic. Yes, but such mysticism is justified if the experience and knowledge of what is holy is not confined to the appreciation of beauty. Through beauty alone we may be carried away into inexplicable ecstasy and yet not know God in the experience. Yet surely we may be allowed to interpret beauty as a thing divine if in parallel experiences of moral and spiritual awakening we hear God's voice?

If some Word of the Lord comes to us, rousing thought, feeling, and will to loftiest heights, then we must attempt to apply it by a constant reinterpretation of life in the highest terms. Once life has been spiritually quickened by contact with God there is no longer room for the mean or ignoble outlook.

We shall discover, however, that there is a prevalent irreligion that belittles the sense of the holy. Life is hard and the world is cruel, we shall be told. Worse still, the character of life has been unmasked and there is no room for reverence. That is the viewpoint of the cynic.

Our text has direct application to present-day cynicism. The word 'cynic,' too, has a peculiar appropriateness in view of its origin. If the first cynics did not object to the epithet 'dog,' it was because they wished to emphasize the necessity of simplicity in life. They were not disbelievers in virtues. But the contemporary cynic has acquired other characteristics of the dog. He growls at life. The modern cynic sneers at idealism; he has no sense of the holy; he is out of patience with goodness. He takes up the standpoint that having discovered the worst about life he can never believe in the best. In fact, he would say, there is no best. The cynic loves the seamy side.

We are all tainted with cynicism to-day, thinks Gerald Heard. 'We believe in the collapse of the best, but never in the conversion, salvation of the worst.' And Dr. Inge, reviewing literature of to-day, comments on the complete absence of that type of character which commands our respect. Of even the greatest writers of the time he says: 'Most of them write as though there were no such thing as religion, or high-minded idealism.' Discussing a recent by-election, the *Manchester Guardian* asked how many men there were in the House of Commons who stood as vividly for anything as a certain candidate named did for the Puritan way of life. 'Not half a dozen,' it concluded, 'Probably not more than one—Mr. George Lansbury. Indeed the trouble with this House is that so few people in it seem to be standing for anything at all.'

Both literature and politics are badly tarred with cynicism. Is religion to suffer the same treatment? Is it to fall into the hands of cynics and have an injection of their poison? Are the cynics to be the acknowledged interpreters of life?

'Give not that which is holy unto the dogs,' may well be applied to our age to mean: Do not let the cynics interpret life and religion in their own terms. We must enter combat to-day where the challenge is fiercest—with cynicism. And though we may be fighting with weapons unknown to the cynic, we have secret armaments of idealism, kindliness, long-suffering with which we can replenish ourselves in hours of devotion. Then out to the fight with those whose faith is gone, with those for whom there is no 'hitching a waggon to a star,' because the waggon is stuck deep in the mud, and their attention is on the mud so that they see no star.

Lest this seems another call for optimism in a world that so often appears to betray the optimist, lest it seem idle dreaming in a world of sternest realities, let us remind ourselves of how Christianity began as a world force. It was when there was little room for empty idealism. It began when men had dared to face life's greatest tragedy: the crucifixion of the noblest they knew. Idealism there may have been in plenty as the disciples tramped about Palestine with their master, but the world mission began after that idealism had gone through the gloomy experience of the judgment and death of Jesus.

Christianity offers an idealism that has faced a crucifixion. Just as Jesus 'knew what was in men,' knew how often they betrayed the best, so Christians have seen in the Cross the terrible worst of sin, cruelty, and hatred, yet dare to believe that the best is possible. This is because they see the Cross as a demonstration of the power of God's love. They can face life with courage and optimism because they have seen an undefeated, undefeatable love.

Intercession and its Objectives.

By Stephen Hobhouse, M.A., Broxbourne, Herts.

In Great Britain and, I suppose, in most Christian countries under a monarchical form of government, special prayers are offered up regularly Sunday after Sunday in the majority of churches for the King and the heir to the Crown. The sins and failings of monarchs are, notoriously, often of the most unmistakable kind. Too frequently, as we know, they succumb to the peculiar temptations which surround the throne. This consideration makes it *prima facie* reasonable to question the value of the prayers, however earnest and sincere, made continually on their behalf, and how far they can be expected to help in the way desired by right-minded worshippers. To discuss the wider implications of this problem is the purpose of this essay. As a point of departure I will take a seemingly decisive case of the futility of much praying, namely, that provided by the history of our English George IV.

From the very hour almost of his birth in 1762, through nearly sixty years as Prince of Wales and as Regent, George was the object of daily or weekly intercessions, in Anglican churches particularly. Some portion of the intense earnestness in praying that characterized the Methodist and Evangelical revivals, which synchronized with Prince George's rising manhood, must certainly have found its way into numberless prayers on his behalf. The character of the best of these prayers may perhaps be judged from an address presented to his royal father after the young George's birth by the Quaker community, in which the hope was expressed that 'formed to piety and virtue he may live beloved of God and man' and may fill the British throne with lustre. Inasmuch as all this praying for him by name started from his very birth and went on while his character was in the mould, it should have had an excellent opportunity for taking effect. In the event, George IV. became, by general consent, an exceptionally worthless type of individual—selfish, deceitful, and malicious over and above his abnormal sexual irregularities.

Undoubtedly we have here a problem which, if properly faced up to, must leave the average believing Christian bewildered and baffled. Are public prayers for those set in authority completely futile? If so, ought they not to be discontinued? Does the apparent failure of our prayers here provide a test case which invalidates all intercessory prayer? If in other fields the good influence of intercession upon individuals appears to be abundantly proved, what lessons can be learnt from failure here?

It must of course be allowed that a great mass of the prayers for royal personages are bound to be merely formal and official and therefore presumably of no avail in the sight of God. In a monarchical State, nominally Christian, particularly one with an established Church, they are regarded as part of the machinery of government for the promotion of good citizenship. They emphasize and inculcate loyalty, patriotism, and respect for the social structure, so largely dominated by aristocracy or wealth. As doing this, prayers for royalty are justified and advocated by many people who have no belief in a God who listens to prayer. And even in the hearts of those who do so believe, intercessions for the representatives of the nation may be little or no more than the expressions of corporate selfishness, the desire that our community should prosper at the expense of other communities. And such prayers, which are by no means made in the name, that is, in the spirit of Jesus, are no more likely to be answered by God than selfish prayers uttered by the individual on his own behalf or on that of his family, regardless of the needs and well-being of others. It is curiously significant of the importance (partly, I am afraid, due to social snobbery) that is attributed to the Crown in this country that no special prayers for the Prime Minister as an individual are prescribed, although the fortunes of our nation depend far more upon his wisdom and integrity than upon the qualities of the Monarch.

Making all allowances, however, it is reasonably certain, as I have already indicated, that a great amount of earnest and unselfish prayer has been directed towards the Royal Family. Many good men and women regard it as a sacred duty to pray for the King and his heir. Why have their prayers, at least in these test instances, been unanswered?

Another extreme type of unanswered intercession may perhaps throw light upon the problem. Many who have made irretrievable moral shipwreck in this life have been the offspring of parents, of whom one or both have been passionately devoted to them and earnest before God in prayer on their behalf from the day of their birth and before. St. Augustine, it is true, accepted the Bishop's assurance to his mother, and maintained that it was not possible for the son of many tears and prayers to perish. Unfortunately this is disproved by the record of many a sad career, though beyond the grave such prayers may well avail.

There is a passage at the end of the Epistle of St. John, in which the writer speaks of those who have committed a 'sin unto death,' saying that he does not enjoin any one to offer prayer on their behalf. However wrong it be to accept this as a definite prohibition of prayer for the worst sinners, yet it suggests that the effectiveness—for this life—of such prayer is very problematic. Here, perhaps, we have a hint for the solution of our difficulty.

God has endowed men with a large measure of His own free will, and being unwilling, perhaps we may say unable, to bring fallen men back into harmony with Himself without the full consent of that free will, He allows men to persist for an indefinite period in ways of life that bring disaster and misery, while they resist the heavenly streams of love and mercy that are ever being directed towards them. In these beneficent streams our intercessions find their natural place, and it is just the independence of human wills, when sufficiently self-centred and rebellious against divine law, which makes them unavailing. There is always therefore a possibility, amounting in cases where the evil will has become, at least temporarily, rigid, to a probability, that in any particular case our prayers will have little or no effect. The mass of obstinate ill-will is, for the time, too opaque for the healing rays of love.

In considering the choice of objects for our prayers it is certainly right in exceptional cases to trust to the guidance of a strong leading or moving of the spirit without supporting arguments. But as a rule reason and experience suggest that they should be directed towards those persons and groups where the conditions are present that will be likely to give an entrance to their influence. This will not be the case where the will of a person appears to be inflexibly set in a course of wrong action, while at the same time external circumstances, especially when embodied in an imposing institution or organization, are such as to contribute to the success of that course. In so far therefore as the shackles of wealth and adulation, of false ceremonial and social custom, bind a king (or still more a dictator) and tend to dry up the flow of human sympathy and humility, it is very doubtful whether prayers for him can be recommended with due economy of effort—except indeed in any case where a strong impulse to pray impresses itself upon the heart as a word direct from God.

I would also suggest that our intercession is unlikely to reach its desired objective unless two factors are present in the mind and heart of the intercessor: first, some considerable knowledge of the character and circumstances of the persons prayed for, preferably at first hand or else in reliance on good first-hand authorities; and along with this a deep and genuine love or at least imaginative sympathy for those persons, not merely a formal sense of duty or a conviction that our own welfare is bound up with their activities, as when men pray passionately in time of war for the general who is most likely to destroy their enemies.

Intercession lists are often printed asking the reader to pray, perhaps on successive days, for particular countries or places and the work of Christian bodies therein; or again, we are invited to pray for particular sick people who are quite unknown to us. In the absence in each case of at least some degree of special knowledge of and sympathetic interest for the objects represented by such names, there seems to be but little reason to think that our prayers, however charged with a fund of sincere undefined feeling, will reach their geographical or personal objective. The same thing applies in the case of many people to prayers for King, Parliament, Church, and so on, used in public and private worship.

It is impossible indeed to assign any value to a prayer which lacks some basis, however small, of unselfish affection or interest. But in the case of prayers, which, having this affection-basis, are nevertheless most unlikely to reach their particular objective, owing either to an insufficiency of knowledge and understanding on the part of the petitioner or to an excess of perversity and unfavourable environment on the part of the person prayed for—it would be quite wrong to suppose that such prayers are wasted and without value for God and man.

In Longfellow's poem of *Evangeline* the priest says to the woman who was searching vainly for her lost lover:

> Talk not of wasted affection; affection never was wasted;
> If it enrich not the heart of another, its waters, returning
> Back to their springs, like the rain, shall fill them full of refreshment;
> That which the fountain sends forth returns again to the fountain.

This rightly suggests that he who truly prays, like him who truly loves, will himself benefit from his efforts, however directly frustrated. But the reality seems to include much more than this; all true prayer that for one reason or another misses its intended object flows into a mighty reservoir, the ocean of God's love, and contributes to swell those outflowing streams, which soften or refresh with drops of blessing all hearts in any degree open to Him. Or, to change the metaphor, we might say that such a prayer is like a light-ray that, meeting with an excessive opaqueness in its direct object, glances off and sheds its healing beams upon other objects adjoining.

In the *Cloud of Unknowing*, one of the earliest and greatest books of mystical religion in the English language, written to instruct learners in the high art of the adoration of God by contemplative prayer, we are told that a pure ‘stirring of love unto God for Himself,’ excluding all thought of any person or thing whatsoever, ‘is more profitable to the health of thy soul, more worthy in itself, and more pleasing to God and to all the saints and angels in heaven—yea! and more helpful to all thy friends, bodily and ghostly, quick and dead,’ than the highest and holiest of other activities conceivable. Just as Christ on the Cross offered Himself up in the veriest sacrifice generally and in common for all, so one who sacrifices himself perfectly in contemplative prayer 'knits all men to God as effectually as himself is knit. And more charity may no man do than thus to sacrifice himself for all his brethren and sisters in grace and nature.' The same old writer says that in ordinary intercession a man may direct his prayer 'to his friend or to his foe, to his kin or his stranger—yea! and sometimes more to his foe than to his friend,' and may express in it his more familiar affection to one, two, or three, just as 'Christ felt such a familiar affection to John and to Mary and to Peter before many others'; but in the highest form of prayer, that is, contemplation, 'in the time of this work shall all be equally dear to him, for he shall feel then no other cause but only God. . . . Whoso will be a perfect disciple of our Lord's, he must strain up in his spirit in this ghostly work for the salvation of all his brethren and sisters in nature, as our Lord did His body on the Cross; not only for his friends and his kin and his dear lovers, but generally for all mankind.'

So, too, in harmony with this teaching, a modern Carmelite nun (as reported by Dom Cuthbert Butler in his *Western Mysticism*), long practised in intercessions for the souls of men, tells us how for years she wrestled with dryness of spirit and with varying distractions of thought and feeling, until at last there came a time when she would suddenly find herself united with God, in a condition approaching ecstasy, and could do nothing but repeat the words, 'My God, I love Thee,' and this simple prayer seemed better than to plead for souls, for *it included them all.*

These expressions of the century-old Catholic tradition indicate the oneness of all petitionary prayer and suggest that its canalization towards any particular human beings is not of primary importance. If our praying is akin to God's nature, He can be trusted to use it in the particular direction where it will be fruitful. At the same time definiteness of object is often useful to prevent prayer degenerating into vague and shallow sentiment; and it is indeed often the inevitable outcome of the heart's loving impulse. For in so far as our hearts are touched by the needs of our fellows, kindred or stranger, friend or foe, they, more than but not excluding our heads, are the best guide to the direction of our prayers; while we may encourage ourselves with the certainty that, in so far as our prayer is sincere, however little it may be able to help its immediate object, yet somewhere or other it will reach a soul who will be stirred by its touch to the winning of a more abundant life in God.

This article has not by a long way fully answered the questions posed on an earlier page. But it has, I hope, suggested why, if we use specific intercession for persons—for those set in authority in particular—we must not, when our intercessions appear to have no influence for good, lose faith in their value, even though we may feel it right to modify or vary them, as heart and head, under God's guidance, may from time to time prompt us.

Much of what is written above will apply also to praying in regard to conditions of society and to social or religious movements, so far as they can be distinguished from the persons involved in them. We may pray for international peace or for social justice or some great reform—for anything that can be comprehended in the coming of God's Kingdom on earth; intercession for such causes may be heart-felt, well-informed, and widespread, and yet may appear for the time being at least to have been completely ineffectual; indeed, reaction instead of progress may seem to be registered. The reason will be in the main because the evils attacked by our prayers are so virulent, so strongly entrenched in the hearts of men and in the organization of vested interests that all our active goodwill is unavailing to dissipate them; possibly, too, because men of goodwill, including ourselves, are not yet prepared to give up reliance upon such things as private wealth, national armaments, and other material supports in exchange for that perfect confidence in God which is the only true security for justice and peace. But in these fields also we may be sure that no true prayer made in the name or spirit of Jesus is ever really wasted. If, for instance, many of us have been praying long and earnestly for international peace, and yet the catastrophe of another world-war comes, because the many evil forces making for war have been too strong for the forces (including our prayers) making for peace, yet every fragment of our efforts will be treasured up in God's storehouse, in readiness for the day when the flames of war will have died down and the task of building up a new and more Christlike civilization out of the ruins of the present ill-founded order is renewed once more.

Hartley Coleridge's sonnet on prayer is not poetry of a high order, but it gets near the heart of the matter:

Pray in the darkness if there be no light.
Far is the time, remote from human sight,
  When war and discord on the earth shall cease:
  Yet every prayer for universal peace
Avails the blessed time to expedite.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Life and Work Conference.

No representative of the Evangelical Church of Germany was present at Oxford owing to the action of the Government. But there had been preparation for the Conference, the subject of which is of so vital interest to that country—Church, Community, and State. This volume of essays is the result.[1] The Introduction is by Bishop Theodor Heckel, the head of what may be described as the officially recognized Church's department for œcumenic affairs. The volume does not contain anything critical of the Government, and a good deal laudatory of it. Some articles may be described as neutral in the Church dispute, but many of them are, more or less openly, propaganda for National Socialism. Lutheran theology offers a basis for the apology, Church and State are sharply separated; the authority of the State is asserted. The Nazi revolution is welcomed as a deliverance from the humiliation, exasperation, and desperation to which the nation had been provoked by the Peace Treaty, and the subsequent treatment by the victorious allies. It is prized as a recovery of the German soul from enslavement to ideas foreign to it. Not only Communism but even Liberalism are denounced. It is even indicated that only by the rigid discipline of the Totalitarian State and the subordination of the individual to the community could such an emancipation be effected. The dark shadows are ignored; Germany appears in the sunshine of security, prosperity, and progress. Anglo-American theory and practice come in for severe depreciation. We must assume that all the writers are expressing their sincere convictions and are not writing to order. If so, the outlook for international and inter-church mutual understanding and conciliation is dark indeed. The German nationalism, which is so threatening to the peace of Europe, is here confidently justified by what to the writers appears incontrovertible reasoning, but to many a reader will seem rather 'rationalization.' One paragraph in the last article dealing with the *Innere Mission* may be quoted as typical. 'A new, powerful government, conscious of its might as of its responsibility has, aware of its aim, entered into the conflict against the needs of the people. A people (*Volk*), awakened to new life, has won a fully new form, has placed itself in all regions of life on a new foundation, has given to all living relations a new ground and a new aim. Germany through Adolf Hitler has experienced, not only a change of its circumstances, but a fully new character' (p. 309).

This collection of essays on one of the most (if not the most) critical issues of the hour, the relation of Church and State, was issued by the Universal Council of Christian Life and Work, the continuation of the Stockholm Conference, in preparation for the Oxford Conference, the subject of which was the Church, Community, and State.[2] While the title *Totalitarian State and Christian Freedom*, suggests a restriction of interest, yet inevitably the general reference cannot be excluded. Although the whole volume is in German, there are English, French, and Russian contributors. The first essay, by Alexejev, deals with 'Society, State, and Church,' and the eighth, by W. Paton, treats the special subject from the standpoint of the mission field. While there is variation in the titles of the other essays, they all handle the same issue though from varying standpoints—Reformed, Lutheran, Anglican, and Orthodox. Detailed discussion cannot be attempted, but some general impressions may be offered.

The Totalitarian State, though in theory it claims authority over the *total* thought and life of the subjects of the State may not in practice assert that authority, but leave a restricted freedom in certain spheres; it claims to be the sole judge of any temporary or permanent restrictions which in its own interest it may impose. Again the Totalitarian State bases its claim on its being the expression of the life of the people (Volk): it can execute the national will more effectively than the democratic system could. These qualifications of an adverse judgment some of the German writers make. As regards liberty a distinction is made between Christian liberty and Church liberty on the one hand and personal liberty on the other. No man can take away Christian liberty, the freedom wherewith Christ makes free from sin, law, and death; here no dungeon can make a prison. The Church's liberty to fulfil its mission and deliver its message and thus the Christian's exercise of that liberty, in outward witness or work, may, however, be prevented, or punished, and thus restricted.

---

[1] *Kirche, Volk und Staat,* herausgegeben von Lic. Eugen Gerstenmaier (Furche Verlag, Berlin, 1937).

[2] *Totaler Staat und christliche Freiheit, 1937*. Forschungsabteilung des Oekumenischen Rates für Praktisches Christentum (Geneva, 41 Avenue de Champel).

In the last essay, Wendland in his title distinguishes *Christian* and *creaturely* liberty, the freedom for self-realization which man as a creature of God can claim according to the divine intention in creating. This distinction Lutheranism tends to emphasize more than do the Reformed churches, which are less marked by the dualism between Christian life and life generally. Can we, however, so separate Creation and Redemption? If man be one surely his Christian liberty is restricted if his creaturely is. Some of the writers who make the distinction do recognize that the Church should concern itself about the liberty of man as created by God, and not only its own liberty. The Confessional Synod has here shown a restriction of interest, which somewhat lessens its general appeal. Universal human as well as distinctive Christian interests are in jeopardy.

* * *

This [1] is another of the volumes, issued to provide material for the discussions at the Oxford Conference of the Life and Work Council on the subject of Church, Community, and State. This volume has a peculiar interest as representing Russian Orthodoxy. Whether the articles were all written in German, or translated, the volume has the merit of a lucidity of style, which German writings often lack; and the first five articles have an obvious relevance to the subject of the discussion at the Conference. The first article on the 'Russian People and the State,' by N. Alexejev, gives an interesting historical review of Russian views of the relation of Church and State, and shows that the theory of the necessary connexion of orthodoxy and Czardom has not been the only one, as is often assumed. G. Fedotov is equally interesting in discussing 'The Kingdom of God and History.' A. Kastaschou hampers his discussion of the relation of 'The Church to the State' by the analogy of Soul and Body, and even by applying to it the Chalcedonian formula of the two natures in the one Person of Christ. Of immediate relevance is B. Vyscheslavzev's comparison of 'Marxism, Communism, and the Totalitarian State.' A transition to the second part of the volume, which deals with Man, is A. Alexejev's 'Marxist Anthropology.' N. Berdjajev offers a contribution to a Christian anthropology, which shows some independent thinking on 'The Problem of Man.' The next writer, S. Bulgakov, extends his treatment of 'Christian Anthropology' to include some fantastic speculation about the divine and the earthly *sophia*, and a plea, based on that speculation, for what in my judgment is superstitious Mariolatry. The editor would have exercised a wise discretion in insisting on the relevance of the contents to the subject of the title. F. Lieb reproduces an article on 'The Anthropology of Dostojewskij,' intensely interesting as showing the vivid interest of a great novelist in man's sin and salvation. B. Vyscheslavzev has two articles dealing with 'The Image of God' as affected by the Fall and as belonging to the nature of man; and W. Zenkowsky covers much the same ground in treating 'The Evil in Man.' Here the orthodox doctrine is expounded and compared with the Roman Catholic and the Protestant. A more serious view of the consequences of the Fall is taken than by Roman Catholicism, but a less rigid than by traditional Protestantism. The divine image has been affected, but not destroyed. The Barthian exaggerations get some hard knocks. While agreeing generally with the conception of man and his value here presented, the insistence on man's divinity and deification does not commend itself to my monotheism; the ethical emphasis is supplanted by the ontological, and the writers seem quite unaware that their dogmatic assumptions are antiquated in modern Christian thinking.

Alfred E. Garvie.

London.

---

[1] *Kirche, Staat und Mensch. Russisch-orthodoxe Studien.* Forschungsabteilung des Oekumenischen Rates für Praktisches Christentum (Geneva, 41 Avenue de Champel).

Contributions and Comments.

A Prophet in his own Country (Jn. iv. 44).

The explanations of St. John's application of this saying are far-fetched. Everything is made plain by a transposition of v.[46]. Thus:

[43]. But after the two days he went out thence into Galilee.

[46]. He went therefore again into Cana of Galilee where he made the water wine.

[44]. For Jesus himself testified that a prophet in his own country hath no honour.

[45]. When therefore he went into Galilee the Galileans received him, having seen . . . feast.

[46]. Now there was a certain nobleman. . . .

This brings the quotation into line with its use in the Synoptists, and indeed assumes familiarity with it. He went (not to Nazareth, but) to Cana. The recurrence of ηλθεν, εις την and Γαλιλαια readily accounts for an accidental omission of what now appears as part of v.^{46} and subsequent insertion in the wrong place. W. A. Wordsworth.

Hindhead, Surrey.

St. Mark vi. 20.

καὶ ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλὰ ἠπόρει, καὶ ἡδέως αὐτοῦ ἤκουε.

Should we read πολλὰ ἠπόρει, or πολλὰ ἐποίει ?

The relationship between Antipas and John the Baptist and the mental action and reaction of one upon the other provide a problem of much interest to the psychologist. It is not, however, as such that approach is here made to St. Mark's narrative, though the psychological aspect can scarcely be excluded altogether. Few readings adopted by the Revisers of 1881 have given rise to so much difference of opinion as that of ἠπόρει for ἐποίει in the above passage, and this applies to textual critics and commentators.

It is to be noted at the outset that, whilst the R.V. adopts ἠπόρει in the text, it has the marginal note 'many ancient authorities read *did many things*.' This implies that the difference of reading was judged to be of such importance as to require a particular notice. The principle on which the Revisers acted is also to be noted; their Preface to the N.T. says: 'The rendering in the text, where it agrees with the Authorised Version, was supported by at least one-third, and, where it differs from the Authorised Version, by at least two-thirds of those who were present at the second revision of the passage in question.'

The manuscript authority for each of the above readings may be stated thus: For πολλὰ ἠπόρει, ℵBL Codex Washingtoniensis (W); Codex Koridethianus Θ, Memphitic. For πολλὰ ἐποίει, ACDΔΠΣ. Lat. and Syr. vss. No doubt the influence of Westcott and Hort went far towards the adoption of ἠπόρει by the majority of the Revisers; their preference for readings supported by ℵ and B is here and elsewhere evident. Fifty years ago, as Sir Frederic Kenyon points out, it seemed as if Westcott and Hort had found 'a royal road to the recovery of the original text of the New Testament,' and that 'we should depart from the Codex Vaticanus (except in the case of obvious scribal blunders) at our peril' (*The Story of the Bible*, 143). The swing of the pendulum seems now to be in a different direction. But this is a matter for the experts.

Turning to comparatively recent commentators on the above passage we find three of the leading ones adopting the reading ἠπόρει—Swete, Bruce in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, and, later, Turner in *A New Testament Commentary on Holy Scripture*. Turner lays stress on the fact that Codex Washingtoniensis and Codex Koridethianus reinforce the reading of the three MSS of one group, representing as they do a different type of text.

Two works on textual criticism may now be referred to. Dr. Scrivener in the 1st and 2nd editions of his *Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament* decides in favour of ἠπόρει. 'We do not hesitate,' he says, 'to receive a variation supported by only a few first-rate authorities, where internal evidence pleads so powerfully in its favour.' In the 3rd edition of his work he retracts that opinion, 'for the former reading (ἐποίει) now appears to me to afford an excellent sense. Herod gladly heard the Baptist and *did many things* at his exhortation; everything, in fact, save the one great sacrifice which he could not persuade himself to make' (pp. 581, 582).

When discussing the passage, Nestle decides in favour of ἠπόρει, but adds that Field and Burkitt are in favour of ἐποίει (*Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament*, translated by Edie, p. 264). Field's influence on the work of the Revisers—though he was not present at their meetings—is touchingly referred to in 'Notes of Recent Exposition' in The Expository Times of August 1899. We may bring this symposium to a close by quoting a portion of the learned author of *Otium Norvicense* when dealing with the passage: 'When Demosthenes says of a certain King who was threatened with hostilities by a neighbouring power, πρέσβεις πέμπων ΑΠΑΝΤΑ ποιεῖν ἕτοιμος ἦν, we understand this of an unconditional surrender on the part of the sender of the embassage. But suppose the message had been ΠΟΛΛΑ ποιεῖν ἕτοιμος ἦν, would not the alteration imply that there was something reserved, some concession that he was unwilling to make.' It is easy to perceive how this applies to Herod, and his relation to the Baptist, as his spiritual adviser. The remark is as old as Elsner *ad loc.* 'πολλὰ ἐποίει, at non primarium illud quod Joannes urserat: *fratris uxorem non dimisit.*' If ἠπόρει is (as we think) a *correction*, it is an easy matter to trace the origin of it. Herod 'was much perplexed (διηπόρει) on another occasion (Luke

ix. 7), though still in connexion with the Baptist. His perplexity in regard to the claims of Jesus was not unnaturally transferred to those of his forerunner' (*Notes on the Translation of the New Testament* [1899] 29, 30).

CHARLES A. WEBSTER.

Bandon, Co. Cork.

Scripture Quotations in the Pastoral Epistles.

A POINT that is perhaps worth adding to Dr. P. N. Harrison's exhaustive analysis of the language of the Pastoral Epistles is the comparatively small use that these Epistles make of Scripture quotations. Counting the quotations in black type in the ordinary Nestle edition, and trying not to recount repetitions in the context, we find two in 1 Ti ($5^{18.\,19}$), four in 2 Ti (two in 2^{19}, one each in 4^{14} and 4^{17}, both of which are genuine notes), and one in Tit (2^{14}). This makes seven in eighteen pages, or an average of 0·39 per page.

The comparative figures for the genuine Pauline Epistles are:

	Quotations.	Pages.	Average per Page.
Romans 1–8 .	19	17	1·12
Romans 9–16 .	45	16	2·81
1 Corinthians .	29	32	0·9
2 Corinthians .	19	21	0·9
Galatians . .	13	10	1·3
Ephesians .	17	11	1·54
Philippians .	6	8	0·75
Colossians .	4	8	0·5
1 Thessalonians	7	7	1·0
2 Thessalonians	8	4	2·0
Philemon . .	0	2	0·0
Total .	167	136	1·23

(I have thought it fairer to quote the second half of Romans separately, as chapters 9–11 form rather a special case.)

Philemon may fairly be omitted. The subject-matter of the second half of Romans and of 2 Thessalonians makes their level of quotations rather high. The others, with the exception of Colossians, show a pretty fair standard of consistency, ranging from twice the proportion found in the Pastoral Epistles to four times the proportion, with an average of just over three times. There does not appear to be any reason in the subject-matter of the Pastoral Epistles for the deficiency.

H. K. MOULTON.

United Theological College,
Bangalore.

Entre Nous.

In the Steps of Moses.

One morning, Mr. Louis Golding, the well-known author of 'Magnolia Street,' was asked over the telephone, 'Will you go to the East this year and follow in the steps of Moses the Law-Giver?' The result of this invitation is the vivid book which has now been published by Messrs. Rich & Cowan (7s. 6d. net). In it Mr. Golding does not tell the whole tale of Moses, but carries it to Mount Sinai where the Lord spake on the top of the mountain and uttered the Ten Words, 'which words are the most familiar to modern ears in our modern world, at least, saving only those other later words known as the Lord's Prayer.' The story is to be carried to its finale on Mount Pisgah in the book which is to follow, 'In the Steps of Moses the Conqueror.'

In his introduction Mr. Golding forestalls our criticism and warns his readers not to read on if they want original ideas, for he and his two companions are going to follow the tradition. 'It was the tradition that most interested us. We feel the tradition's as likely to be true as anything that can be found out at this date. And, in any case, it has a real truth of its own, just because it is the tradition. . . . "And you see, sir," Lucas helped me out. "We went through the alternative routes. And they're all comparatively dull. The traditional route is so beautiful and so exciting."'

So Mr. Golding and his two companions, their motor cars, and drivers, are ready to start off. But where are they to go first? What is the site of that spot where Moses was found by Pharaoh's daughter? They decide on Roda Island in Cairo. But do not take this identification too seriously, the author hastens to add, for it has not even any persistent tradition to back it. Then a picture of the veiled years is built up and the framework filled in with stories from the Talmud and Josephus. From Memphis (the capital of Rameses II. who is accepted as the Pharaoh of the Oppression) the journey continues to Heliopolis, where Moses would go 'to study under the best masters.' But the bulk of the book is concerned with the Exodus and the stages of the journey, and again Mr. Golding and his companions question themselves as to where was then this place and where was the other. Or whether the identifications are right or wrong. The reader meantime enjoys the descriptions and admires the photographs.

'Tayibeh contracted into a narrow defile, when the darkness hung back in the grottoes like lurking beasts. The blue thrust of the sea came out upon us suddenly, one blue, and another blue, and another, a whole sea in exquisite damascene of blue. Then, the moment we emerged, the substance of colour changed. It ceased to be compact like stone or metal. It became veined like flowers or leaves. Beyond, on the right hand, the hills of Africa defiled southward, in a shimmer of pink and lilac and royal purple, washed in the rose-water of the winter sunset. On the left hand the promontory of Abu Zenima defined the bay, with a gesture of arrest; so that the mind announced to itself: that is a good thing. Could the egg-shell stuff of the old skull endure much more? Or at the next onslaught of white-peony cloud and pink-daisy wave edges and primrose hill would the poor thing cave in?

'So we removed from Elim and encamped by the Red Sea.'

And so at last they came to the Convent at the foot of Mount Sinai, where Mr. Golding admits rather ruefully that, 'Moses is harder to see than he was in the first centuries,' and where he finds that the relics of St. Catherine rather than the relics of Moses are the chief pride.

It is well to remember—for how seemly it is—that the Louis Golding writing about the Holy Mount was once the little Jewish boy listening in a kitchen in Doomington to his father reading from the Holy Books.

'"The Mountain?" I cried, from the metal stool where I sat. "What is the name of that Mountain, father?"

"Hush! hush!" whispered my mother and my sisters faintly. A slight strain constricted the atmosphere. It was not considered seemly for any one, least of all one of the younger members of the family, to let his voice be heard when my father was reading from the books, and expounding them.

But he was in no unamiable mood that evening. "Let him ask! What was it you were asking, son?"

"I was asking the name of that Mountain? The one which Moses climbed to look down on the companies."

"It is called Horeb, or Mount Sinai, the Holy Mountain. Why do you ask, son?"

"Because I have been there! I, too, have climbed it!"

The smile faded from his eyes. He looked at me in silence for twenty seconds, then turned his head slowly back toward his book.

My mouth quivered. The tears started in my eyes. "Perhaps I did not, father! Perhaps I did not!"'

It is in the last chapter that the reader feels most strongly the spiritual quality of the book. 'I will not make words, I told myself, regarding the view from Gebel Musa . . . for the Holy Mountain is a spiritual, not a physical experience. Few men have ever reached the summit, and few will get there again. . . . The ascent is hopeless if neither behind nor before your eyes the thunder crashes and the lightning flares. Perhaps it is only when the Mountain is veiled round with impenetrable cloud, that the Mountain begins to be visible at all.'

Manna?

In the Wadi Feiran, in the manna country, Mr. Golding met a Greek monk with some Bedouin servants. Where did that manna come from which they gathered at certain seasons, he asked them. 'It is from the Lord,' the monk answered. But the Bedouin servants had something different to say. Later he met a scientist in Jerusalem, Dr. Bodenheimer, and for the first time tasted 'manna.' 'Having removed the cork, he allowed two or three crystals of manna to fall into my palm. I lifted them to my mouth, and closed my eyes, that I might the better savour them. It was sweet, honey-sweet, but I thought I detected in it the faintest flavour of liquorice.'

Dr. Bodenheimer's account of its origin agreed with that of the Bedouin servants, though differently expressed. 'He has observed and photographed the *Trabutina mannipara* in the act of actually excreting the manna-substance, in beads that vary between pinhead-size and the size of peas. Where there were no insects, he found there was no manna. He discovered later that another insect of the same group, the *Najococcus serpentinus minor*, also ejected the stuff. On their issue, the beads of manna were as transparent as glass and of the consistency of hard syrup. In a few days they crystallized and became in colour anything between milk-white and yellow-brown.'[1]

Dr. W. Foxley Norris.

A touching story of the late Dean of Westminster is given in the *Record*. Mr. W. E. Hurcomb writes:

The late Dean of Westminster I knew before he came to Westminster, and in volume ii. of *My Life and Diary* is recorded: 'Some years ago, in a very poor home in Barnsley, there was a lad who was very ill and continually in great pain; the case was so bad that the doctor went every morning early, about 7.30, to see him.

'One morning the doctor, out on his errand, met the rector going to the station. The two walked on a little way and the doctor happened to mention the sad case he was going to see. They parted—the rector went on to catch his train and the other, soon immersed in the business of the day, thought no more about the chance meeting. The next morning, about seven o'clock, there was a knock at the door of the little house where the boy lived. The mother opened it and saw an unknown gentleman in black clothes, who asked to see the patient, as if he were another doctor. He went upstairs and sat down, and talked to the boy about all manner of interesting things that were going on in the world outside. "I'll draw you one thing I saw," he said, and, taking a card from his pocket he hastily sketched a picture of two dogs fighting. The sick boy watched the picture grow. "But who are you?" he asked in amazement. "I am your neighbour," was the smiling reply. The next minute the strange visitor was gone, and when the doctor arrived the boy showed him the card in great delight. "Look at what my neighbour has done for me," he said.

'Every morning the doctor found that this mysterious visitor had called before he arrived, and cheered the boy with his talk and his pencil. The patient had always another picture to show him. A man on a runaway bicycle, two people talking; simple, quick drawings of some amusing incident. The mother began to pin them up on the bedroom wall—the jolliest picture gallery imaginable. When the dark hours of the night tortured the sleepless, suffering lad, he looked forward to the morning, when his beloved visitor would call. The rector never failed him. More than once the lad asked him who he was, and always was given that friendly reply, "I am your neighbour." The doctor, of course, found out, but he kept the rector's secret. These two men fought the demon of pain in that poverty-stricken home until the boy passed on to the dawn of an eternal day. We do not know the doctor's name, but we do know the rector's—he was a rector at Barnsley and became in 1925 Dean of Westminster.'

Carried by Many Prayers.

In the issue of *The British Weekly* for September 30, part of a fine letter, recently written by Pastor Niemöller, the Vicar of Dahlem, from his cell in the Moabit Prison in Berlin, is given. The letter ends with the following words: 'I would like to tell you that I am not only unbroken after six weeks of imprisonment, but am full of joy and gratitude for God's gracious guidance. . . . It is one of our Lord's unfathomable truths that His trust upholds our peace of mind in all situations of life. It really seems as though nothing at all had happened, precisely because everything has happened, everything that had to happen everywhere.

I am now resting in peace after the abundant turmoil of the last few years and am waiting, patient and full of confidence, if the Lord will again need me for service outside these walls. When and how? It is not for me to worry . . . I know that I and many others whom God has committed to solitary places are carried by many prayers. Remember me to . . .'

Future Life.

In his recent volume of reminiscences—*Moments of Memory*—the Hon. Herbert Asquith writes concerning his father and the question of a future life: 'I rarely heard him discuss a problem of philosophy. During these later years I remember one occasion when the conversation suddenly turned to the subject of psychic research, and the value of the evidence it had supplied on the question of the survival of the soul. He seemed to listen with interest, but he did not take much part in the discussion, and at the end of it he suddenly lifted his head and said that he thought we were 'not meant to know' what happened on the other side of death.

---

[1] Louis Golding, *In the Steps of Moses the Lawgiver*, 230.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

We are now in the season of Advent. In three weeks' time we shall be at that annual pause when for many 'plain living and high thinking are no more.' Before beginning our usual Notes let us take one second to say genially and very cordially to all our readers 'All the compliments of the Season!'

We have good news for you. We can solve one Christmas problem for you and thereby and by the same act give you some valuable assistance towards clearing up another. The one we can solve is the annual one of the Christmas present. There has appeared a book which we can whole-heartedly recommend. It is Canon F. R. BARRY's *What has Christianity to Say?* (S.C.M.). The price is five shillings net. Some will wish, of course, to spend more than that; but, however much more you give, make this book part of your gift.

In this fine book Canon BARRY sets in clear light the other Christmas problem to which we have alluded. It is this: Can the ordinary Christian without irony or doubt in his voice wish his neighbour 'A Merry Christmas'? Or can the minister in these days preach on Christmas with much of the old confidence and joyous assurance? That many ministers feel bewildered about it we have ample evidence. It used to be so easy to discourse on subjects like 'What difference did Jesus make?' or 'What if Christ had not come?' To-day, the world being what it is, and religion being in the parlous plight in which it seems to be in many parts and among so many people in all parts, what is one to say about it? What has Christianity to say or what is Christianity able to do in a world which proudly declares that Christianity is a back number for which it has no use?

Instead of strictly following Canon BARRY and making citations from this masterly book, let us set down some points gathered from the book as a whole. First, we must resolutely and honestly face the facts of the present situation, however unpleasant they be. It admits of no doubt that in our time the area that once seemed to be effectively occupied by Christianity has very seriously shrunk. It is of little real comfort to say, 'Well, that just means that the hold of Christianity was only apparent, not real.' We question if that be true, even if true it does not help. When non-churchgoing spread, we cheered ourselves by a thought that religion was not infallibly bound up with church-attendance. When the older theologies lost their grip, we thought it might turn out to be not altogether a disadvantage. But we have more and more evidence that the Christian ethic is by multitudes not only questioned in theory but contradicted in practice. And that is a grim fact which makes facile optimism impossible, and raises the question, Has Christianity finally failed? Is its day over?

We are living in an age which in many respects is curiously like the world into which Christianity was born. Philosophies have criticised one another into impotence. Scepticism abounds. Strong but vague enthusiasms have a brief run and then fade out. Further, we have a dehumanizing factor which the first Christian centuries knew not—man is the slave of machinery, and his wonderful engines have outstripped his character. Let us face the fact that Christians in this age are rapidly approaching being what they were in primitive Christian times—a small body in a pagan world.

Second, from this approximation of our world, spiritually and morally, to the world to which Christianity came, we gain real understanding of a feature of that ancient world which has puzzled many—Cæsar-worship. It is difficult to understand how hard-headed Romans and quick-minded Greeks could ever have found any satisfaction in worshipping the living Cæsar. Yet under our eyes we see the thing, in its real significance, happening again. Devotion to the State is for millions supplying all the religion they seem to need. Towards the State they express real religious fervour. In devoting their lives wholly to the service of the State their questionings as to the significance of their individual lives are set at rest; their life is seen to have meaning and purpose. The ancient worship of Cæsar was only a more picturesque form of the same thing. Let us make no mistake, there is something of genuine spiritual satisfaction in Fascism and Communism. In fact, the alternatives before men in our day are just what they were so long ago, Cæsar or Christ.

Third, the real catastrophe would be that Christians should become panic-struck and speak in the accents of defeat. ‘We are perplexed, but not in despair,’ wrote St. Paul, and, in still grimmer circumstances, his cry from behind prison-bars was, ‘Rejoice, again I say, rejoice.’ The anti-gods mission of the Buddha, the worship of Cæsar, and the religious fervour of the anti-God campaign in Russia are in the last analysis demonstration of the truth that man is incurably religious. He craves something that will integrate and give meaning to his life. He craves something vastly mightier than himself that will take care of him, provide him ‘a place in the sun,’ and which he may serve with confidence and joy. He knows that real life is found only on the path of surrender and self-sacrifice.

Because in our time multitudes have apostatized we should not despair. It is very distressing, but it is no sort of proof that Christianity's day is over. When we see the son of godly parents setting out for the far country, we are indeed grieved for him; but we do not begin wondering whether religion is played out. Should we do so any more if a generation or a century turn its back on the Faith? The Church has perhaps been overmuch deluded with the nineteenth century naïve belief in the inevitability of progress in steady upward direction, forgetting that each new generation is a new problem, and that each man must be born again.

In a world curiously like our own Christianity won a notable victory. Is there any reason to doubt that the wonder can be repeated? Time, we may be surely confident, will be on the side of Christianity. The deified State has no element of permanence about it. A ‘god’ that is subject to vicissitude and even to destruction will not long satisfy the religious cravings of men. Men, too, will some day realize that too big a price is being paid for such benefits as the Totalitarian State confers, that it requires too utter a surrender of personal rights. As against Christianity the idolatry of the State seems immeasurably poor.

Such are the thoughts suggested by a perusal of Canon Barry's book. For an adequate diagnosis of the situation and guidance how to meet it, we refer our readers to the book itself.

There is in our day welcome and increasing evidence that the Church, hard pressed on all sides, is rallying its forces for a counter-attack, and is being led to concentrate its energies more and more upon its own specific work of evangelism. To those in all the churches who are looking for help and guidance in regard to this all-important matter we can cordially recommend a valuable little book by the Rev. Frederic C. Spurr, *The Evangelism for our Time* (Epworth Press; 2s. net). It is highly illuminating and practical, and contains the ripe experience and reflection of a great Christian preacher and teacher.

The religious situation, as we have said in the preceding Note, is discouraging enough, but not such as to lead Christian people to despair. 'Does the tide always come back like that, after it's gone out?' asked a little boy at the seaside. And his father answered confidently, 'Always, my son.' The religious tide is far out to-day, and there are many who predict that it will return no more. Christianity is on its death-bed, they say, and the date of the actual demise is authoritatively given as round about the year 1965! 'The only answer to these people is to refer them to history, and especially to their own fathers in the unfaith, who were as confident as are their descendants that Christianity would soon become a thing of the past. They said it in the second century, in the third, in the tenth, the thirteenth, the sixteenth, the eighteenth, the nineteenth, and they will continue to say it. Meanwhile we may recall to them the word of Tertullian, "The Church is an anvil that has worn out many hammers."'

History is the best corrective of pessimism. It is a record of continual ebb and flow. There come into the life of man strange tides of the spirit, when life surges up to higher levels and human energies express themselves in great ways. Then there comes the ebb, when men grow slack, sensual, material, when faith, hope, and charity fail, and the lowered spiritual vitality predisposes the spirit to various maladies: doubt, denial, quarrels, misunderstandings, greed, social dissensions, and, finally, sanguinary wars. Then, disillusioned, sick and desperate, men rise from the dust and call upon God. So it has ever been in the past, and so doubtless will it be again.

Meantime, what can be done to turn the ebbing tide? Last year the *Morning Post* published a series of articles under the heading of 'The Empty Pew,' in which various people gave their reasons for having abandoned the Church. The main reasons given were such as these—that the Christian Creed is outworn, that criticism has undermined the authority of the Bible, that comparative religion has destroyed the exclusive claim of Christianity to be the revelation of God to man. The answers showed great ignorance of what the Church claims and teaches; and doubtless were in large measure due to the secular atmosphere of our time, and to the poison of rationalism which has been assiduously circulated through the blood of the people. But the fact remains that such ideas flourish in the heart of Christendom, and the question is, Who is responsible for this?

Has the Church done all it might have done to make its message intelligible to this new age? Is it enough to affirm dogmatically certain truths and trust to the Spirit of God to convince the mind and heart of the hearer. No doubt, apart from the working of the Spirit, all our efforts are in vain. 'St. Paul believed that, but it did not absolve him from the obligation of reasoning and proving, when he dealt with the pagan world.' In short, the apologist is needed no less than the evangelist, and most manifestly needed in our time. 'But the new apologetic must be very different from the old. Paley and Butler are of little use in our day. Their atmosphere is not ours. We have to deal with a wholly different outlook. A scientific conception of the universe and a new psychological account of personality are to-day in possession of men's minds. It is with these that we have to reckon, and through these that we must make a new approach to the thought of God. And it will be found that, by a new route, we shall arrive at the old goal. It can be shown that evolution, fairly interpreted, so far from dispensing with God, makes Him all the more necessary. The old "analogies" still hold good, but in a new setting. "Purpose" in the life of the world, can be demonstrated.' And in general it can be shown that Christian faith has a firm basis deep down in the very nature of things.

The work of the apologist, however, can only be preparatory. It may indeed help to clear away difficulties which are an obstacle to faith, and that is a great service, but it cannot give to men a personal certitude about God. All human argumentation has an element of uncertainty about it. It is a structure which is liable to give way. Man's need can only be met by a sure Word of God upon which his feet can be securely planted as upon a rock. And surely it will not be denied that the world is in desperate need of such a Word of God to-day for its guidance and salvation. 'The world is blindly groping after a new social order. Communism comes forward with its promise of paradise below on condition that we rid ourselves of the last remnants of belief in God and Christ. Fascism has its programme. Labour has its plan. And after all our efforts we are in captivity again, in the midst of a world armed to the teeth, and feverishly preparing for what many speak of as an "inevitable war." By general admission we are in a desperate plight, fearful, suspicious, defending ourselves against a dreaded outbreak of fresh devilries.'

Now it is the Church's mission to tell the world that there is to be found in Christ that sure Word of God for lack of which the world is perishing. Christ tells us 'the truth of things, namely, that man wrongs his brother, because he is wrong with, and wrongs, the Heavenly Father. And he cannot treat his brother with justice and love until he returns to the love of the Father.' And with the truth Christ gives the power. His word from the beginning was 'with power,' and so it has continued to be. 'It saved that old world, by giving a meaning to life when life had lost all meaning. For a pantheon of gods, which men held in contempt, it revealed God as Father—Holy Father. It created a new and genuine brotherhood. Jew and Gentile, Greek and barbarian, master and slave, entered a new fellowship in which all became new men in Christ. It redeemed man from his evil passions and vices, and made saints of the scum of the earth. And it has continued as "power." It is available for man to-day.'

Here, surely, is a gospel worth believing and worth preaching. It is based upon historic facts, for God in Christ has entered into history. We must keep our feet firmly upon that ground. It used to be the fashion among those who had drunk at the wells of Hegelianism to say that eternal truth could not be made dependent upon contingent happenings on the field of history. When Christian faith is thus divorced from the facts of the gospel story it straightway becomes thin, evanescent, and futile. The Christian preacher has a story to tell, and based upon that story he has a message of good news to give to the world—good news about God in His relation to man, and good news about the whole of human life. 'What man needs to know about God is this: does He care for us in any personal sense? Is He with us in our struggle? Is He a helpless beholder of man's evil, or is He working against it; His good free will against man's evil free will? Can He redeem us from our hereditary handicap and make us completely human? And when life here below is ended, has He a home elsewhere to which we may go? It is the gospel alone which answers these questions.'

How is this message to be got across? There is a great variety of ways, each useful in its own place, but none of them sacrosanct or to be slavishly followed. The new age may call for new methods, and the book before us has many valuable hints as to possible methods, but the writer lays special stress on personal evangelism. 'I was one of a company of about ninety men assembled in a London committee room, who saw John Clifford die—or rather pass into the fuller life. In his last moments upon earth this great man, who throughout his long life as pastor, teacher, preacher, and social reformer was always an evangelist, pleaded for a restoration in the Church of the ministry of personal evangelism.' This opens the widest door, for it is not too much to say that the Church, through its members, is in actual touch with nearly the entire population. And it needs no deep spiritual experience to qualify a disciple of Christ for bearing witness to the truth as he has found it. Andrew was but a beginner when he found his brother Simon and induced him to come to Jesus as a fellow-learner. There can be no offence in Andrew's method. 'I have found the real Master of life at last. See if I am not right. Then let us follow Him, you and I, together.' Men are impressed by the sincerity of that witness, while they would be repelled by an implied profession that we are better than they.

A symposium on the old yet ever new subject of *Revelation* has recently been issued under this title by Messrs. Faber & Faber. The cost of the volume is 7s. 6d. Professor John Baillie of the University of Edinburgh explains in the Preface that the volume is intended as a contribution towards the task and witness of the Church militant in the present age; and Mr. T. S. Eliot, who supplies an Introduction to the subject, appears to suggest that the Church militant may take heart even in this faithless and perverse day inasmuch as the current secularism is 'not a solid force of disciplined troops, but a varied host of allegiances.'

There are six essays more or less bearing on the subject proper, and in them six different Christian communions are represented. The writers in the order of their essays are Professor Karl Barth, representing the Swiss Reformed Church; the Archbishop of York, representing the Church of England; Professor Sergius Bulgakoff, representing the Greek or Orthodox Church; the Rev. M. C. D'Arcy, S.J., representing the Roman Catholic Church; Professor Walter M. Horton, representing not only the Baptist Church but the 'rising generation of Christian thinkers in America'; and Bishop Gustav Aulén, representing the Lutheran Church and Scandinavia. It will be interesting and instructive to compare their views of revelation.

Barth is purist or exclusivist in his use of the term. The only revelation entitled to the name is that which has taken place and is still taking place in Jesus Christ. Any other so-called revelation is revelation only in 'a perverted, invalid, and loose sense' of the concept. Once the need of divine grace in Christ is recognized, the discussion as to whether there is not revelation elsewhere than in Jesus Christ is superfluous. Such an attitude no doubt serves to emphasize the Christian sense of the newness of the Christian revelation.

Dr. Temple is not so intransigent. Revelations in other religions he allows, but of course he regards them as partial and incomplete as compared with the revelation in Jesus Christ. Nor does he favour a concept of revelation unrelated to the nature of the universe and of history; but while thus distinguishing between special and general revelation—that in Nature and in history—he holds our interpretation of general revelation to be unreliable, unless it is established by some special revelation 'wherein the divine nature and character are manifested as the diffused rays of sunlight are gathered in the focus of a burning-glass.'

Bulgakoff is true to the tradition of the Orthodox Catholicism in fully admitting the existence of a natural revelation of God in His creation, in Nature, and in the human spirit. Every pagan religion, he affirms, contains a kernel of divine revelation. But this essay is a difficult one for the Western mind to follow.

Father D'Arcy is so far with Barth in saying that what is directly communicated by God Himself, and is named by the Apostle Paul the gospel of Jesus Christ, is revelation in the strict sense of the word. Indeed, he welcomes the 'austere tradition of Protestantism' for which the Barthian theology stands. But, true to Roman Catholic tradition, he does not refuse the name of revelation to the witness of God unto Himself through physical nature, the souls of men and their activities, and in morals and art. In natural religion, however, man is 'like a blind man reading braille.' In supernatural revelation a new path is opened up which man himself could not trace.

Dr. Horton's is a most readable essay, informative and pointed. He welcomes liberal Protestantism as having made reverence for all truth a part—a permanent part, he hopes—of the Christian conscience. But he thinks that it has tended, through its contact with the notions of scientific discovery and religious insight, to lose the distinctive

996

element in the idea of revelation, namely, in E. F. Scott's words, divine 'disclosure of a realm of truth which cannot be apprehended by sense or by ordinary processes of thought.' The concept of revelation, as he appears rightly to point out, would never have been invented if the element of the 'given' had not in some special cases been infinitely more impressive than even any communication of new meaning from another person could be.

This American theologian would add a third category to those of general and special revelation, incidentally modifying the usual meaning of special revelation. He conceives of divine revelation as taking place in a general way in Nature and history, in a special way in the history of Israel and the Christian Church, and in an unique way in Jesus Christ. And he is in line with Dr. Temple and consciously opposed to Barth in maintaining that the gospel is falsified or distorted if the revelation in Nature and history is ignored. 'The man who knows only Christ does not even know Christ.'

Bishop Aulén's essay is also opposed to Barth's exclusivist attitude. The Christian view of revelation, as he tersely puts it, is at once universal and exclusive; and in the history of Christian thought we can often observe the tension between universality and exclusiveness. But he is careful to insist, with the other essayists, that general revelation is not to be put on the same level as the revelation of God in Christ. Like the other essayists, he interprets the subject of revelation generously; so it is not surprising to find him taking occasion to lay stress once more on the soteriological notion which he expounded in his 'Christus Victor.'

Old Texts in Modern Translations.

Isaiah lxv. 11 (Moffatt).

By Principal W. F. Lofthouse, D.D., Birmingham.

'Spreading tables to Good Luck, pouring libations to Fate.' It was never more true than to-day that we know not what a day may bring forth, and that no one can boast himself of to-morrow. The possibility of some convulsion which shall shake our society to the depths is always before us. We whisper to one another of what will happen if, or even when, the war breaks out. And when we turn our thoughts to what after all is nearer to us, our own private and family concerns, things are no better. In spite of all that science has done to give us security and to ward off catastrophe, we are at the mercy of ill-fortune—an illness, an accident, a quarrel, a hot breath of passion suddenly sweeping us off our feet, and we find ourselves looking ruin in the face. 'What is God doing?' we cry in the bitterness of our heart.

This is however no new thing. We are not the first to feel like children groping in the dark. Were our grandfathers any more secure, or the contemporaries of Shakespeare, or the Hebrews of the Old Testament, or the builders of Stonehenge, or the Cave-men of Altamira? Mankind has always dwelt on an island surrounded by the ocean of the unknown and unpredictable. The youth of to-day hesitates about committing himself to any stable occupation. 'Who knows,' he asks, 'whether Armageddon will not burst before I am in the saddle? Life is nothing but a gamble.' But youth has always had plenty of excuse for asking this. We are not the first to tremble at the approach of the end of the world, or at least of our own private world. It is a kind of nightmare, this horrible uncertainty. Sometimes we call it fate; an obscure and pitiless destiny that holds us in its unescapable grip. Sometimes we call it chance. It bids us to the gaming table; but the dice are loaded, and we know it; and though with a desperate laugh we resolve to try our luck, we know what the end will be. Is there really nothing but this? Is life so futile? Are we, as St. Paul said of the whole creation, made subject to vanity?

Now to all this, religion has one definite answer. Life is not ruled either by fate or chance, but by the divine will. The future lies, though often we use the words unthinkingly, on the knees of the gods. It is not a thing or a force, but a person, with whom we have to do. But this unhappily may leave us no better off than we were before. The will of God may only be fate under a more ruthless shape. The old Greeks talked of fate as ruling even the gods. Beneath the frown of destiny Jove himself may be impotent. But if it be absurd to suppose that God Himself is a subject, then the stern movement of fate is God's own decree, and heaven itself is turned to brass. So the Moslem thinks of Kismet as the will of Allah; so the Calvinist thinks of the inscrutable decrees of the ruler of heaven. Yet to abide in such a thought as this is beyond our power or our endeavour. If there be on the throne of God a person, however inflexible, we shall try to bend him, in defiance of logic and experience alike. The sterner we imagine him to be, the more resolute and the more costly will be our attempts. It may be true that

> the moving finger writes and, having writ,
> moves on;

but we will not believe that neither piety nor wit

> can turn it back to cancel half a line.

So we try prayer or sacrifice, or give the fruit of our body to avert the doom of the sin of our soul. Perhaps—who knows?—some special form of words, some chosen incantation, may turn aside the horror that advances on us to the house of a stranger or a foe.

There is no end to the shifts with which we try to escape from the net, or to the unreason with which we persuade ourselves that we may stay the mills of God. One of the strangest achievements of this unreason has been to make a god of chance itself, and by the side of the unchanging to set up an altar to mutability. Anything is better than this terrible 'it is my will; who shall stay it?' The mind refuses to receive such a creed. It falls back on the impersonal fate, chance, luck. Yet it cannot surrender the guess, the dream, of the personal. Blind force is as unendurable as omnipotent decree. Thus, chance itself is deified, and must have its sacrifices, its libations, its prayers. This is indeed the attitude described, with a few vivid strokes of the pen, in our text. We may be forgiven if we use a little imagination. There is no hint as to the actual date of the author, or the situation in which his denunciations are aroused. Yet we can be pretty certain that the men of his age, as of every age, trembled at the unknown. Every century after the Jewish exile brought its own anxieties, its new threats to peace, its melancholy disasters, its marvellous escapes. Who could tell, from year to year, whether fortune would smile or frown? And thus these harassed Jews, for all the faith in Jehovah which their fathers had handed down to them, but which seemed so incapable of driving away their fears, bethought them of the dark yet fascinating cults in which their new neighbours, the Greeks, were taking refuge.

Those nocturnal gatherings in the woods—sacred groves, the worshippers called them—the excited circles round the graves, where surely the spirits were still present that might hear and answer; those sacramental feasts on swine's flesh, forbidden in the law of Moses and for that reason the more tempting; that sense of being possessed by some mysterious power, some uncanny taboo—you can read it all in the previous verses of the chapter. Who knows, they would ask, if there may not be something in it all? Where all is uncertain, who will venture a confident denial here? The Jewish mind had always been hospitable to alien rites—to superstitions, as the Puritan would call them. Only at some time of severe crisis, as in the old days under Ahab, was the Hebrew tempted to forsake Jehovah altogether. But in spite of all the thunders of his prophets, he insisted that Jehovah too should be hospitable and kindly, and allow other altars beside His own. A fatal demand. For when we bring in a second deity by the side of the first, the first will be forsaken or ignored. Dagon falls crashing to the ground when the ark of Jehovah is brought into his shrine. No wonder that Jehovah had said, 'ye shall have none other gods beside me.' Yet this is what our writer watches taking place. Not content with the thick night air of the groves, the incense and the smell of swine's flesh burning, they must organize their meal, as it were, and call to it their gods, the objects of their hopes and fears; here, Good Luck; there, harsh and sombre Fate; spreading their tables to the one, pouring their libations to the other. Not for them the solemn and familiar but useless daylight ceremonial of the Temple; the dark mysterious dealings with yet darker and more mysterious powers called for the secret gloom of night.

After all, there is nothing exceptional in all this. The Jews were only seeking a refuge from helplessness that all have tried to find, and seeking it upon a road that most men have trodden. It is related that, perhaps a century before these words were written, the citizens of ancient Rome, driven by the misery of an exceptionally hard winter, had recourse to a rite unknown within their walls before, and spread tables to half a dozen of their gods, choosing some of the most respected men in the city to superintend the banquet. Is it a wholly different state of mind which bids the dwellers in some Indian jungle village, terrified by the awful scourge of cholera, to slaughter a goat, tie its entrails round the neck of their half-demented priestess, send her dancing wildly down the village street, while they snatch at the raw flesh and devour it? The rite differs, the culture of the worshippers differs, but the mood, the emotion, is the same. Disaster is possible; it is at the door; it is upon us. We know not whence it comes or how to induce it to depart. But fear and longing combine to give it a body, and, so to speak, a soul. It can be, it must be, moved by prayers, or by action of some sort. Anything is worth trying.

Not that we need always proceed to extremes. A few beads will keep away the evil eye, as every traveller in Greece or Italy to-day is aware; or we may fix a lucky figure on our motor car, or take a mascot with us wherever our regiment is ordered to march. The gambler will discover that he has lucky and unlucky days, and will propitiate ill-fortune by some secret movement or spell of which he is half, but only half, ashamed. It was not very long ago that in our English villages a woman would make a wax image of the enemy of her client, and slowly melt it, as did the Roman witch twenty centuries ago, before the fire. Even to-day young people will dream of a love-philtre, and, mating superstition with science, ask for it from the chemist. Nor is it the ignorant and uneducated only that pour the libation to fortune. The crystal-gazer and the fortune-teller draw their consultants from Belgravia and Mayfair. The devout worshippers of chance at Newmarket and Epsom will give equal welcome to tips from the stable or subtle and enigmatical predictions of a winner. In every casino can be found the devotee of a system, another ritual for the worship of the great unknown. Even in the houses, and the hearts, where evangelical piety might be supposed to dwell, lurks the fear, the yearning, born of uncertainty and desire, which, whether it takes shape in the acts of false worship or not, scourges and plagues us in our soul, till anxiety chokes our prayers and paralyses our devotion and our cult. Those old Jews did not repudiate their Jehovah; they put another altar beside His; they admitted other emotions beside the humility and reverence which was His due; and they drove Him away.

Such is the result, for us as for them, when once men give up faith in God as the only supreme power and authority in their lives. The human heart is the same in every age. We cannot trust the being that lies within the shadow. We must discover for ourselves the best and the worst. We must force, cajole, or bind the unknown to our will. We must inquire of the oracle and then try to reverse its prediction. Or we waive all claim to bliss, and try to bear, with what stoicism we can muster; or turning in silence from the neglected altar of God, we sit beside the idol's tables and spread to fate the still darker offerings we make to force, to fraud, and to greed. Realism, we call it; beginning by regarding chance as our lord, we end by taking no chances, by risking nothing in loyalty either to morals, to kindness, or to truth. 'That fatalistic outlook appears in direct proportion to the loss throughout society of a living belief in the omnipotence of a God who is also a God of those miracles which express His power over the natural.' In Italy, they tell us, castor oil, scientifically used, has served for a libation. And 'stone-dead hath no fellow.'

But to all this comes the reply: 'I make the sword your fate, to slay and slaughter every one of you; for when I called you'—is the prophet proclaiming the divine word to the men of his generation, or of ours also?—'you would not listen when I spoke.' Once we give up our faith in God, the supreme, the just, the merciful, we are lost. How different from all this, the faith of the Christian! He knows that God is not fate or destiny. He is not a machine, grinding out so much of what we call evil or good, with no regard for its results on our well-being. God is a person, and as such He has a purpose. Nor is He, like weak men, inconstant and wavering. And therefore His purpose does not and cannot change. Something of that purpose the Christian can see in the solemn rhythm and regularity of Nature; the stars in the heavens and the seasons on earth; and even in the more than mathematical subtleties of the atom and the mysterious adaptations and transformations of the cell.

> What immortal hand or eye
> Could frame *that* fearful symmetry?

Everywhere there is plan and intention, moulding stamen and leaf, claw and finger and muscle, and creating by some greater miracle the power of thought and the rapture of delight. And this purpose culminates in the good of man himself; for a God who did not will His creatures' good would be a devil, and a God who could not accomplish it would be a weakling. Man cannot bind this goodness to His own ends. His own wisdom has been found again and again turned to folly. But he can acquiesce in its decrees; he can co-operate in its working; he can accept it as bringing some blessing; and lo, the blessing is there. The 'stake in his flesh' turns to a messenger from God to him for good. Evil itself is but a step in the ladder by which he mounts nearer to God. Who then can separate him from the love of God, when even tribulation and anguish reveal some fresh depth in God's mercy, and nothing can fright the soul that trusts in God?

The Christian is indeed well aware that others may scoff at such confidence, flinging away the elixir of life that their scepticism forbids them to taste. But are they, he asks, any better off? Are they even more rational interpreters of Nature and of life? What men call misfortunes come to them as to him; if they refuse the divine touch that transforms evil into blessing, why should he doubt his own secret, or, for their crude belief in some sinister robot of destiny behind the world—some blind chance or luck, entreated but unheeding, like another Baal by his worshippers on Mount Carmel—forsake the faith which verifies itself in a hundred hours of need?

Let them make their way, if they will, to their furtive groves, to their desperate libations. He knows the path to another garden, dark beneath the overhanging trees, where he has watched a solitary form, bent in an agonized passion of prayer. 'My Father, if it be Thy will, let this cup pass from me.' But Jesus, who foresees the bitterness of the cup, knows what is His Father's will. And bitter and sweet alike are as nothing to the magnificence with which that will is clothed, and the joy of sharing it and of carrying it out. 'Not as I will, but as Thou wilt.' That is the triumphant answer to the inevitable dread of what is on its way to Him. Whatever it costs or demands, He will, He can, choose nothing else. Was there then no other way? Nay, what mattered it whither the way might lead? Enough that it was His Father's choice.

> Winding or straight, it leads
> Right onwards to Thy rest.

Let others then pour their wine to fate, exalting their own desires, their own terrors, into a god. He who has watched the Saviour nerving Himself for the last and noblest conflict of all, has learnt a finer ritual. He will pour the devotion of his life to Him who inspires and crowns such worship and such confidence. Even if his 'life-blood has to be poured as a libation on the sacred sacrifice of the faith his friends are offering, he will rejoice,' and at the end of his happy journey, just before the trumpets blow to welcome the pilgrim into the spiritual land, he will cry, 'the last drops of my sacrificial libation are falling; my time to go is here. Now the crown of a good life awaits me, which the Lord will grant me at that day.'

Is this too high for us? Shall we go back to the midnight altars, the swine's flesh smoking beside the tombs, the trivial little mascots, the nonsense of the gambler's system, the crystal and the planchette, or the ghost of a prophet summoned from the shades of Endor? What an insult to the humanity that was made in the image of God! Christ has shown us what we are, because He has shown us what God is. And we are made of finer stuff, and intended for higher ends, than this sorry business of luck and fate. Resignation, obedience, co-operation, triumph; those are the tones in the mighty ground-melody of God, the grand chord of the C Major of this life. Beside such a psalm of praise and devotion, the twitterings and mumblings of the trembling incantation are drowned. For Jesus, though men have called Him a man of sorrows, a bosom friend of grief, knew that He lived in His Father's house. There He prepares us a place, and there He bequeathes us His joy, and the peace which no man can take from us.

> If I stoop
> Into a dark tremendous sea of cloud,
> It is but for a time; I press God's lamp
> Close to my breast; its splendour, soon or late,
> Will pierce the gloom.

◆

The Advent Hope.

By the Reverend Frederick A. M. Spencer, D.D., The Rectory, Great Rollright, Oxon.

The predictions in the Gospels concerning the end of the world, or consummation of the age, have long constituted one of the major problems in the understanding of the teaching of Jesus and in theology generally. Liberal Protestantism, as represented by Harnack in Germany and Broad Churchmen in Britain, passed them over as unessential. The eschatological school of Johannes Weiss and Albert Schweitzer, followed to some extent by Roman Catholic modernists, stressed them as being of the very core of the Redeemer's message, contending that He expected their fulfilment in a few months or years, though it did not happen. Recently there has been a swing back of the pendulum in the 'realized eschatology' represented by Professor C. H. Dodd in *The Parables of the Kingdom*; namely, that, according to Jesus, the Kingdom of God has already come (not 'is at hand'), and men have merely to enter and appropriate it; also that He made little or no reference to a distant future. I doubt whether this interpretation will be able to maintain itself any more than its predecessors. Certainly Jesus did speak of the Kingdom of God as in some sense already present and within reach; but He also taught His disciples to pray 'Thy kingdom come,' and, unless the records are very corrupt and misleading, foretold His future return in triumph. I venture on an interpretation of His predictions not very far removed from that of traditional orthodoxy, withal attempting to show that there is a reasonable prospect of their coming true.

When Jesus sat on the Mount of Olives with Peter and James and John and Andrew a few days before the Crucifixion, we may picture Him, as with gaze intent on far horizons, talking, talking, talking about things to come, with rapid flow of speech, while scene after scene unrolled itself before His imagination. We may place the Apostles below Him, listening rapt and spell-bound, drinking in as much as their dazed and slow minds were capable of absorbing. And when after some hours He had ceased, and the evening shadows were upon them, we can in our mind's eye see Him arising and leading the way down the hill, and the little silent company returning late to supper in the friendly home at Bethany. Soon anxiety, next terror and dismay, then horror and anguish, occupied their minds, and last, after a brief interval of numb despair, came the bewildering joy of Easter. Months or years later they tried to recall the outline of what He had told them that afternoon, and these chapters in the Gospels fairly represent the residuum. Little wonder that His predictions of the nearer cataclysm of the destruction of Jerusalem and the remoter cataclysm at the end of the age became confused in their memories and accounts.

Several experts in the criticism of the New Testament have attempted to discover in Mk 13 a Jewish apocalypse with which the genuine record of the predictions of Jesus have been interlarded. Thus Dr. Charles, following Colani, who wrote in 1864, suggests that vv.[7. 8. 14. 17-20. 24-27. 30. 31]—all in fact, which clearly concerns the destruction of Jerusalem, together with the saying, 'This generation shall not pass away, until all these things be accomplished'—was a 'Christian adaptation of an originally Jewish work, written A.D. 67-68.'[1] On the other hand, both Matthew and Luke attest that He did foresee the Roman conquest of Judæa, and it is not unlikely that He made some mention of it to His disciples on that solemn occasion when He told of His return with great power and glory. But it is quite understandable that their recollections were after the lapse of years unable clearly to distinguish His prophecies of the end of the Jewish State and of the end of man-made civilization as a whole.

In any case these chapters contain several indications that, though Jerusalem would be destroyed before very many years had elapsed, yet His coming in power to establish the Kingdom of God upon earth would not be till long afterwards. 'When ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars, be not troubled; but the end is not yet.' These words suggest a considerable stretch of future history. 'For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: there shall be earthquakes in divers places; there shall be famines: these things are the beginning of travail.' These verses [7, 8], though assigned in the above-mentioned theory to the Jewish apocalypse, seem to take one beyond the comparatively peaceable conditions of the early Roman Empire to a later world of clashing states. It is as if Jesus were looking down the vista of history through a long succession of national conflicts and natural disturbances, which become more violent and frequent as they mount towards some appalling climax.

---

[1] *Eschatology*, by R. H. Charles, p. 384.

'And because iniquity shall be multiplied, the love of the many shall wax cold.' These words, only in Matthew, which, whether or not from his special source, called M, are at least as reliable as the portions of Mark attributed to the Jewish apocalypse, suggest a waning of religious ardour in a world that had in large measure previously been genuinely, even if very imperfectly, Christian. 'The many' would first have to be won to the new faith, which would take some time; subsequently persecution and false teachers would unsettle them or their descendants and chill their love for Christ and God and man. Changes such as these usually require more than a single generation.

'The gospel must first be preached unto all the nations'—in the portion of Mark not assigned to the hypothetical Jewish apocalypse. Surely this process would take far longer than a human life-span, at least with the slow transit and communication in ancient times.[1] To bring the good news of salvation and the Kingdom of God to all the peoples of the earth, so that there would be some in every land prepared to welcome the returning Christ, would require more than such rapid missionary tours through the countries adjacent to Palestine as St. Paul made in Asia Minor, leaving a few trails of small bands of converts, but rather an extensive and intensive evangelization and training in the Christian life, covering vast and distant areas among millions upon millions, many barbarous and sunk in degrading superstitions, and others long schooled in creeds and accustomed to modes of worship incompatible with Christianity. Apart from some stupendous miracle, of which there is no hint, it would be a work of centuries.

'And Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.' These words are in Luke only, and though from their position we cannot with any assurance assign them to his special and very reliable source, L, yet, in view of the Evangelist's profession of historical accuracy, they have a strong claim to represent an authentic utterance of Jesus. What do they mean? Surely that Gentile civilization was to be allowed time to develop itself under the influence of the gospel, as Israel had developed itself under the influence of the Mosaic legislation. Now the times of the Israelites from the giving of the Law on Sinai to their end in A.D. 70 were about 1500 years. Should we expect that the times of the more complex Gentile civilization would be less? After the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen Jesus is reported to have declared that the Kingdom of God would be taken from Israel and 'given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.' The singular, 'nation,' is perplexing; perhaps it means 'any nation'—any nation that was willing to receive and live according to the revealed principles of the Kingdom of God. However that may be, these two passages in conjunction suggest that one or more Gentile nations would be given ample time to absorb and put into practice Christianity before the Son of Man should return to introduce a new stage of history.

And, finally, He said that no one knew the date of His coming again, 'not even the angels of heaven, neither the Son, but the Father,' and just before the Ascension we read that He told the disciples that it was not for them 'to know the times and seasons which the Father hath set within his own authority.' That the early Christians, despite these various intimations that the end of the age was generations, if not centuries, ahead, persisted in expecting the return of their Lord to deliver them from their present perils and persecutions, may be regarded as in some sense a providential delusion. But their impatience did not succeed, we may think also providentially, in obliterating these intimations, so that we in our times can detect them and draw our own conclusions.[2]

If we may trust the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus predicted that the present age would culminate in world-wide disturbances, both in human society and in the physical environment, so severe as to threaten the extermination of the race; for 'except the Lord had shortened the days, no flesh would be saved.' We may suppose terrific storms and seismic upheavals causing the inundation of low-lying lands, 'the sea and the waves roaring,' and volcanic eruptions polluting the atmosphere with suffocating gases. This would cause the darkening of the sun, while volcanic fire-balls might be taken for stars falling. Then suddenly in a clearing sky He Himself would appear, surrounded by the luminous cloud (*shekinah*) associated with the presence of Deity, and attended by a host of angels. These would proceed to collect the saints from all over the earth, parting work-mates and bed-fellows. I suggest that the saying about the eagles, or rather vultures, swooping down upon the carcase refers to the angels detecting them with marvellous keenness of vision as they scour the world. He would then establish His kingdom, assigning positions of responsibility to those who had developed and proved their capacity in His service in accordance with their previous success, as is implied in the Parable of the Pounds, in which the man who had gained ten pounds is set over ten cities and the man who had gained five pounds is set over five cities, and the promise to the Apostles that they would sit on (twelve) thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel, a picturesque description hardly to be taken quite *au pied de la lettre*. Many who will expect to be admitted will find themselves excluded, to their great disappointment and chagrin.

---

[1] St. Paul used the expressions 'throughout all the world,' and 'in all the world,' of the spread of the gospel (Ro 1^8, Col 1^6), by which he probably meant the countries bordering on the Mediterranean and under the dominion of Rome. But allowance must be made for some conventional hyperbole. The phrase, 'all the nations,' in Mark seems to be more explicit.

[2] Dr. Swete in his commentary on the Gospel of St. Mark shows some inclination to interpret the saying, 'This generation shall not pass away, until all these things be accomplished,' as referring to the human race or some phase of it. He gives instances from the LXX and the N.T. of γενεά being used of a race or class of men and claims some patristic support.

Jesus said nothing about the world being consumed with fire, as is foretold in the Second Epistle of Peter, nor is He recorded to have connected the resurrection of mankind, or even of the righteous, in which latter, at least, He apparently believed, with His return in power and glory, except perhaps in Jn $5^{28.\ 29}$, a very debated passage. We may gather the impression that He looked forward to a reconstituted and regenerated human society on earth, in which the ideals adumbrated by the Israelite prophets, of universal peace and righteousness and the true worship of God, would be progressively realized. The fate of those excluded is left, no doubt purposely, very vague. Seeing that His Heavenly Father was said by Him to love His enemies, we cannot suppose that He would lose that characteristic upon the establishment of His Kingdom, but that He would allow others to be incorporated into it as after various periods of discipline and penitence they should become fit, which seems to be borne out by the remark of Jesus to the hypocritical Pharisees, 'The publicans and harlots go into the Kingdom of God before you.' His primary purpose when He returns in power and glory will be, it seems, to constitute under His direct and manifest rule the nucleus of a spiritual humanity, which will be used for the ultimate redemption and sanctification of the whole world, so that eventually all evil—sin and death and hell—will be completely conquered and abolished. It is a fascinating and glorious prospect.

But are we really to believe and expect all this? Of course it depends very much on what opinions we hold regarding the supernatural. But I am prepared to maintain that something of the kind is probable on almost any theory of reality that can be accounted Christian. I should not wish to insist much on the great tribulation, seeing that this does not appear in one stratum of the eschatological teaching attributed to Jesus, Lk 17^{22-37}. On the other hand, the case is very strong for the existence of demonic powers,[1] a secret conglomeration of corruption and malignancy that has been gathering force through the ages and might break out in a world-wide cataclysm. Again, we need not accept quite literally all the prophetic imagery with which the prediction of the Second Advent is adorned. But that God will drastically terminate the prevailing disorder and misery and establish His reign of peace and goodwill, is an expectation deducible from the Christian conception of God, the loving Father in Heaven. And it is not unreasonable to think that He whom we revere as the Saviour will make Himself manifest in the fulfilling of the salvation which He has begun. Moreover, however much we are impressed with the appearance of gradual evolution, alike in the organic, the human, and the spiritual realms, it is also remarkable that evolution is apt to be punctuated by catastrophic changes, terminating a previous phase and inaugurating a succeeding; sudden transformations in life and its conditions, of which the consummation of the age at the coming of the Son of Man will be an outstanding example. The present frustration of the idealistic aspirations of mankind seems to call for such a liberating upheaval and new beginning.

Again and again men have sought with cunning calculations based on obscure arithmetical allusions in the canonical Scriptures to foretell the Second Advent after a few years—with inevitable disappointment. Not so did Jesus instruct His disciples to discern the signs of the times. Are we not justified in attempting so to do by the hints which He has left us? In the first place, we may note the immense material progress of recent times, both theoretical in the exploration of stars and atoms and the intricacies of organism, and practical in the multifarious inventions for command over the physical environment. As the comparatively very slight material achievements of the Greco-

---

[1] As I argued in an article entitled 'Demonic Powers: The Case for their Reality,' in *The Hibbert Journal*, April 1935.

Roman world preceded and facilitated the spiritual advance that sprang from Christ in His first coming, so, by analogy, we may postulate that all that science has accomplished in the past couple of centuries is a preparation for another spiritual advance which Christ will initiate in His second coming. It does appear as if the times of the Gentiles were nearing their fulfilment, that is, as if the civilization of Christendom had almost run its appointed course under the stimulating and moulding influence of the religion that bears His name. The new outlook and the new powers have produced a situation which Christianity, as it has taken shape in the interval, is incapable of satisfactorily dealing with. The problems both of thought and of practice have grown beyond the scope of what we have been brought up to believe and to do. The principles of their solution are, it may be contended, implicit in the pure gospel of Jesus—the Fatherhood of God, the ideal of absolute love, eternal life, the Kingdom of God. But the application of these to the vast tracts opened up by astronomy and biology and psychology, and to the baffling international and economic complexities of our material civilization, does not lie sufficiently on the surface for the conviction of scientific theorists, or the persuasion of governments and reformers, or the guidance of the drifting multitudes like sheep without a shepherd. The world desperately needs a new revelation, authenticated and compelling, to enable it to escape from the chaos into which it has blundered and proceed along the new and living way to which it is called. There is only One with sufficient authority to deliver that revelation and make evident its saving efficacy.

The love of many has indeed grown cold—very much because, dazzled and bewildered by the stupendous achievements of science, with all the powers and excitements and discoveries which it has lavished on the general mass of men, they have lost interest in that which the Church, or Churches, have most insisted on—an amalgam, as they unfairly judge it, of a set of unproven and more or less improbable dogmas, unconvincing schemes of salvation, superstitious sacramentalism, uninspiring worship, and tame and impracticable virtues. Meanwhile, entangled in meshes of their own weaving, and victims of perils and disasters of their own contriving, depressed rather than exhilarated by the illimitable stretches in space and time to which science has opened their view, they are prone to a sense of helpless perplexity. But with all their shortcomings, the Churches have kept before the world the figure of Jesus, which now exercises its mysterious fascination and appeal more widely over the earth than ever before. For the gospel has been or is being preached to all the nations and all the tribes. Yet what can He avail, if He be but some one in a remote and ever-receding past? Surely there are some in every inhabited corner of the globe who would welcome Him should He make His presence known.

Never before have there been such enlightened aspirations and well-thought-out endeavours for human welfare—large schemes for the consolidation of the nations in peaceful co-operation, careful plans for the improvement of social conditions, constant progress in educational theory and practice, wise and sympathetic dealing with the failures and the unfortunate, determined attempts to eradicate all kinds of maladies, utopian visions of universal brotherhood and well-being—a healthful practical idealism springing from the combination of the principles of Christian ethics with the scientific study of man and his environment. But never before have the forces of evil appeared so mighty and so insidious in thwarting and wrecking hopes and schemes for a better world, fostering in some insatiable greed and ruthless ambition, in others suspicion, fear, and irrational antipathies, and in many shortsighted egoism and cynical apathy. There have been in the past epochs of widespread strife and enmity, wars and revolutions and persecutions; but scientific invention, while greatly augmenting man's ability to help his fellow, has also multiplied his resources to hurt and to destroy. Across the fair face of the earth the approaching tribulation seems to be casting its ominous shadow, with the premonitory mutterings of the tempest about to break forth in devastation. But this to those who understand is a cause, not for dismay, but for exultant hope, as the Master said: 'When these things begin to come to pass, then look up and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh.'

He told His disciples they would be forewarned of His approach, as the tender shoots of the fig tree herald the coming of summer, with an obvious reminiscence of the passage in the Song of Solomon: 'The fig tree ripeneth her green figs, and the vines are in blossom, they give forth their fragrance. Arise, my love, my fair one, and come away' (2^{13}). Apparently they understood Him by this to be referring generally to the disturbances in the world which would constitute the great tribulation —rather a forced and inappropriate analogy we might be tempted to think. But shortly before, we may remember, came the incident of the denunciation of the fig tree, one day rich in foliage but destitute of fruit, the next day withering and perishing. This, some commentators suppose, was taken by Jesus as an emblem of Israel or Jerusalem, with its pretentious religiosity and practical sterility, soon to crumble into ruins.[1] May not this subsequent Parable of the Fig Tree, alive with the promise of fruit, have signified Israel in a far-off appointed revival?[2] And are we not at the present time witnessing a wonderful recovery of the ancient people of the Jews, who, impelled partly by persecution, are seizing the unforeseen opportunity of becoming a free and prosperous nation in the land of their inheritance? Indeed, most of the great nations of mankind are astir with nationalistic ambitions and enthusiasms; which accords with St. Luke's version of the Parable: 'Behold the fig tree, and all the trees: when they now shoot forth, ye see it and know of your own selves that the summer is now nigh.' Are not these signs by which we, even we, may know 'that He is nigh, even at the doors.'

In the approaching crisis there is a special call for fortitude, watchfulness, prayer, and loyalty to our Master, that we 'may prevail to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man.'

---

[1] *e.g.* Allan Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel*, p. 212.

[2] In Rabbinical literature Israel was compared to a fig tree because of Hos 9^{10}: 'I saw your fathers as the firstripe in the fig tree at her first time.' It is recorded in the *Yalkuṭ* ('Compilation,' assigned to the thirteenth century) that Yudan, a teacher of the fourth century, said that the fig tree was a symbol of the multiplying of Israel, because it becomes increasingly fruitful as the season advances. See *The Jewish Encyclopædia*, 'Yudan.' In *Agadath Shir Hashirim*, a commentary on Hosea assigned to the tenth century, among seventy names for Israel mention is made of 'the fig' because of Hos 9^{10} (Edition by S. Schechter, line 115).

Literature.

OLD TESTAMENT SACRIFICE.

The world of British Old Testament scholarship has produced two standard works dealing with Sacrifice among the ancient Israelites, that of Robertson Smith and the posthumously published work of the greatest of British Old Testament scholars, the late G. B. Gray. To these must now be added a third, taking almost equal rank with the other two, and filling up the gaps which their scheme necessarily imposed on the earlier writers. This last is the great work of W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D., Litt.D.—*Sacrifices in Ancient Israel: their Origin, Purposes, and Development* (Hodder & Stoughton; 12s. 6d. net)—in which the author sums up the conclusions reached after a lifetime of Biblical studies. Robertson Smith laid a firm foundation in the general Semitic conceptions of sacrifice, with special reference to those of Israel. Gray dealt with a number of external details, such as the altars and the festal calendars, in addition to his special contribution to the theory of sacrifice. The former scholar laid stress on the communion element in sacrifice, the second, on the idea of a gift made to the deity, though neither was blind to the importance of the aspect stressed by the other. Dr. Oesterley has concentrated on the ideas and motives underlying sacrifice in Israel, and to the two already mentioned has added a third—the thought of sacrifice as liberating the life of the victim for the use of God and man—insisting that any adequate discussion of the subject must take all three into account. The book is a balanced and penetrating study of the history of sacrifice in Israel as embodying these three fundamental ideas—perhaps feelings rather than ideas.

After a general indication of the presence of these three elements in the sacrifices of uncultured peoples, Dr. Oesterley narrows down the field of his research to the Semitic world, and shows how, in countless instances, an ancient ritual preserves the record of primitive ideas which have often been forgotten by the worshippers themselves. Israelite sacrifices began with the birth of the nation, during the nomad period; not merely was the Passover regularly observed, but other forms of festival and offering were normal. Here Dr. Oesterley (as he is practically bound to do) relies mainly on general religious psychology and on parallel customs known to have existed among other people on the same level of cultural, social, and economic development. Five chapters, forming the core of the book, are given to the sacrifices of the agricultural period, and the author's main thesis is skilfully and convincingly worked out. Many scholars hold that the prophets of the eighth and seventh centuries denied the existence of sacrifice in the wilderness, and Dr. Oesterley devotes a chapter to the discussion of this subject, coming to the conclusion that only a single passage in Jeremiah can be fairly claimed for this point of view. The post-exilic period is then similarly treated, and in the last two chapters Dr. Oesterley carries his three basic principles into the thought of Jesus and of the Early Christian Church, showing how they find their fulfilment only in the death of Christ.

It would be superfluous to remark that this book is the result of many years of patient, laborious, and scholarly research. Not only is Dr. Oesterley familiar with the Bible itself; he has at his finger-ends the whole literature of the subject, and the abundant references to other works can represent only a fraction of all that he considered and studied. It is, therefore, very difficult to challenge any conclusion which he has reached. Two points, however, may be mentioned, on which disagreement seems less hazardous than elsewhere. The first is the question of sacrifice in the nomad period. Here the evidence is less certain than in other parts of the book. That Israel, even in those early days, must have had some external means of making and maintaining contact with Yahweh will be universally admitted. But does it follow that this took the form of normal sacrifice, even though the institution was familiar among some other nomad peoples? Direct evidence is very scanty; we cannot be sure of the historicity of the details handed down by tradition. The prophetic attitude, in spite of Dr. Oesterley's powerful argument that the objection was not to sacrifice *per se*, but to sacrifice offered in an unworthy spirit, is still far from clear, and it might have been more satisfactory to claim that Jeremiah was not the only prophet to be mistaken on the historical point. A more serious omission, especially in view of the last chapters of the book, is the absence of reference to the forms of covenant ritual indicated, *e.g.* in Gn 15 and in Ex 24. True, these are not sacrifices in the strict sense, inasmuch as the victims are not offered to any deity, and this may have been the reason why they have not been discussed. But they offer a signal illustration of the principle that life may be liberated for the use of God and man. Further, it is surely in this feature of Israelite religious life that we may see one of the main threads in the complex doctrine of the Christian atonement? It is hardly possible to escape the feeling that Jesus Himself (to judge from Mk 14^{14} and 1 Co 11^{25}) found here one of the strongest of the motives which led Him to the Cross, and such a passage as He $9^{15\text{ff.}}$ suggests that the Early Church was not wholly oblivious to it. Perhaps in a later edition—or even in a separate monograph—Dr. Oesterley will give this matter as thorough a discussion as that which he has devoted to the meaning of sacrifice in the narrower sense. But, even allowing for this deficiency (if it be a deficiency), the book is one of the most important contributions to the study of Hebrew religion that have ever appeared in this country, and, with the work of Robertson Smith and Gray, forms a noble and enduring monument of Biblical studies.

THE BIBLE COMES ALIVE.

The stream of knowledge, long hidden under the soil of Palestine and neighbouring lands, continues to flow so strongly that Sir Charles Marston, one of the most devoted and munificent supporters of Biblical archæology, has thought it needful to issue a new volume, *The Bible Comes Alive* (Eyre & Spottiswoode; 8s. 6d. net). The main object of the book is to indicate how the external evidence supplied by archæology is confirming the Old Testament. After outlining some of the testimony that has come to light and discussing its bearing on the Old Testament, the author describes in detail the most recent discoveries made at Lachish under the superintendence of Mr. J. L. Starkey. Two chapters are devoted to the celebrated Lachish Letters, written in ink on potsherds, which were found beneath the floor of the gatehouse and belong to the early sixth century. These documents, eighteen in number, are communications from some officer commanding a military outpost to the supreme governor of the city, and are the first personal letters in pre-exilic Hebrew writing found in Palestine. They have been deciphered and elucidated by Professor Torczyner, of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, whose book on the subject is now being published. One cannot peruse Sir Charles Marston's volume without renewed feelings of indebtedness and gratitude to him for his great services to archæological research. Not many distinguished Old Testament scholars, however, whose work is to interpret the discoveries, will agree with the Biblical standpoint he adopts or all the deductions he makes. The excavations being carried on in the Near East undoubtedly fit into and supplement the Old Testament narrative, and are opening up a new chapter in Bible history, but the author's standpoint that the material of the Pentateuch cannot be distributed among different schools of writing, that oral transmission of any of the events is inadmissible, and that the Higher Criticism, so-called, of the records is entirely of a negative or sceptical nature, is one that few scholars experienced in Old Testament questions will approve of. The same may be said of some of the author's deductions. The translation, for example, by Professor Langdon of the writing on the red pottery bowl ('His righteousness is my hand'), now known to be entirely wrong (the letters are Phœnician and read 'In the third . . .'), is adopted and put forward as one of the facts testifying to 'the authenticity of the Sacred Narrative,' and as constituting an 'outside contemporary evidence of its genuineness' (p. 247). At the same time, the author's views as to the value of the Bible for the experiences of to-day, and its neglect by professing Christian people, are much needed and deserve wide publicity. If the Bible enshrines the Divine wisdom of the ages, as it undoubtedly does, there is surely nothing that can supersede its lessons, and these are more than ever necessary to-day when so many dangers threaten our civilization.

As for the Lachish Letters, while all scholars recognize their value in the confirmation of Jewish history, the author's conceptions regarding their date and other matters are open to serious question. They give every evidence of dating from Zedekiah's reign, not Jehoiakim's, and to place them in the latter is to miss their true meaning and significance.

These criticisms, however, of the volume are of little account compared with its real value. Sir Charles has produced an important book, one of his best, calculated to open the eyes of people indifferent to the Bible, and to enhance the credibility of the Old Testament. The information it gives us is of supreme interest, not only to Biblical students, but to ordinary readers. It is beautifully illustrated, contains several important appendices, and gives a comparative chronology of Egyptian, Babylonian, and early Biblical history.

INDIA REVEALS HERSELF.

Mr. Basil Mathews in his book, *India Reveals Herself* (Milford; 5s. net), seeks to reveal India to the West by letting us hear her own sons speak. No better method could be followed, especially in the case of one, like Mr. Mathews, who is only a fleeting visitor to the land. He has discharged his task with skill and sympathy, and has succeeded in presenting in the brief compass of this little volume what is probably a truer picture than many larger books achieve of the political discontent that embitters the spirit of so many and makes the relationships of British and Indian often so difficult. This is not the whole truth about India and we are loath to believe that it is true at all, and yet to shut our eyes to these facts is both foolish and cowardly. Mr. Mathews tells his story, extenuating nothing, but setting nothing down in malice, and it will be for our country's honour if we learn this book's uncomfortable lesson.

It is true that relationships have probably become rather less strained since Mr. Mathews made his investigation. In the last few months both political India and political England have abated something of their stubbornness and come a little nearer to each other. A freer and a more natural air seems to be blowing since the Congress governments have been set up, and Indians find themselves setting a course for the various provinces that is their own choice—whether it be good or bad—and not dictated to them. That from now on all will be well is too much, of course, to expect, but every month that goes past without 'safeguards' being invoked helps to establish a convention that will make them presently unnecessary and ensure greater freedom. The prison doors are opening, and the shadow of a repression that earned us many a *tu quoque* from the German and the Italian is lifting. Mr. Mathews in his chapter 'Whither?' could not foresee those changes and he has the wisdom to refrain from prophecy. And yet why should he not dream, as he does in an earlier chapter, of a day 'when the strange and the new have birth,' and when Jawaharlal Nehru 'will sit in Westminster or Geneva helping to weave the fabric of a new comity of nations.'

But India is not only politics though their sombre shadow has too long darkened the land's clear sky. Mr. Mathews provides welcome relief when he turns aside to describe the beauty of Ajunta and the cultural renaissance of which he sees clear signs. If he sees truly, then India is coming to the end of what the editor of the 'Legacy of India' calls the most sterile period in her history. One feels that the future of the new culture is still very uncertain. Even if one agrees with Mr. Mathews that Jawaharlal Nehru has set a fine standard for a prose literature in English, and that Sarojini Naidu has shown facility in producing English lyrics, still it is to the vernaculars that one must look for a renaissance that will stir the spirit of the great body of the people. Rabindranath Tagore declares that it is 'the sorrow of separation' that inspires his poetry. Something of the same kind gives its charm to the prose of Nehru, that man who, as an Indian described him to Mr. Mathews, 'feels with the skin of an Englishman.' But while such inward conflict may create beauty in a single spirit it will hardly suffice to produce a literary renaissance.

Mr. Mathews does not omit the Christian forces in India from his consideration in this little book, but in another volume, soon, we understand, to appear, he will deal more at large with that element in the remaking of this people. The two books together will provide an excellent survey of what is happening at the present time in this land of so many possibilities. It is good that such books by one so skilled in painting a vivid picture should be available to interest our reluctant minds in the rebirth of a great nation.

THE PARABLES.

The Rev. B. T. D. Smith, D.D., has contributed an invaluable critical study to the problems of the Parables in his *The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels* (Cambridge University Press; 12s 6d. net). The work consists of two parts. In Part I. he discusses the introductory questions relating to the Mashal, the varieties of Figurative Speech in the Synoptic Gospels, the Form and History of the Parables, their background and the religious ideas which they contain. Part II. is a commentary on the Synoptic Parables. Dr. Smith treats first what he calls 'Parables for the Times,' including the Fig-tree in Spring, the Strong Man Spoiled, the Sons of the Bridechamber, the Thief, the Ten Virgins, the Porter, the Waiting Servants, the Unjust Steward, On the Way to Court, and the Barren Fig-tree. Then follow the Parables of Growth: the Mustard Seed, the Leaven, the Sower, and the Patient Husbandman; and three chapters are given to Parables for Rich and Poor, for the Hierarchy and the Scribes, for the Pharisee and Sinner. Finally, various Parables are examined which cannot easily be classified—the Unmerciful Servant, the Tower Builder, the King Preparing for War, the Wicked Husbandmen, the Two Houses, the Body's Lamp, Salt, the Patch and the Wine-skins, Old Wine and New, the Vultures and the Corpse, the City on a Hill.

Dr. Smith's treatment is careful, scholarly, and thorough. Parallel versions in the Gospels are examined in detail, and similar Rabbinic parables are cited. Perhaps Dr. Smith is a little too suspicious of allegorical features as, for example, in the Sons of the Bridechamber and the Wicked Husbandmen, but almost always the comments are sane, judicious, and illuminating. The book will prove an indispensable guide to any student who desires to make a study of the Parables in the original; and for the Seminar and the Class-room there could be no better textbook. We congratulate Dr. Smith on a very fine achievement. Not forgetting the recent stimulating book of C. H. Dodd, and the scholarly work of W. O. E. Oesterley, we have no hesitation in describing this volume as the best modern contribution to the study of the Parables.

THE GROWTH OF CONVOCATION.

Convocation of the Clergy (S.P.C.K.; 15s. net), by Mrs. Dorothy Bruce Weske, A.M., Ph.D., published for the Church Historical Society, is a study of the antecedents and the rise of Convocation with special emphasis upon its growth and activities in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The writer, who is from Cleveland, Ohio, worked on her subject at the University of London, the British Museum, Lambeth Palace, and other places on this side of the Atlantic, not to speak of the Cleveland Public Library and other libraries in America. Three years ago she presented her work as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Radcliffe College, and amply earned the award of that degree.

After an account of the development of ecclesiastical assemblies in England before and after the Norman Conquest, the relations of the lower clergy and Parliament in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries are considered. It appears that the lower clergy were first summoned to Parliament in 1295, but that they attended and continued to attend only in a consultative capacity. But if their position in Parliament was nominal, in convocation it was important. They realized in convocation the king's dependence on their grants and their power to delay royal procedure.

The problem of attendance on parliaments and convocations was one that affected all degrees of the clergy. There was the expense of it, whether attendance was in person or by sponsor, and the consent to new taxes on their spiritualities that might be involved. No wonder they bent their efforts towards transferring their greater activity to convocation.

By the end of the fourteenth century the framework for procedure in the Convocation of the

Province of Canterbury became fixed—the definite order of ceremony and business, the separate deliberations of higher and lower bodies, and the precise formulation of grievances and reforms. With the subject of grievances and reforms that of grants was closely linked. But never in the fourteenth century did the clergy reach a position strong enough to make grants absolutely dependent on the redress of grievances.

A comparison of the provinces of Canterbury and York shows that the province of Canterbury generally occupied the place of leader in the decisions. This was not due to the conscious assumption and forcible maintenance of a principle, but to the larger size of the province of Canterbury and its freedom from the raiding Scots, which made for greater financial resources.

What of the contribution of Convocation to the development of the English Constitution? Here is Mrs. Weske's answer: The contributions of the clergy were 'their adherence to the principle that in assemblies or congregations which concerned the whole body of the clergy, there should be representatives from every degree of clerical status; their insistence that those who were to give money for a grant should take part in the deciding of the amount thereof and the terms on which it should be yielded; their maintenance of the practice that the conditions of a grant and the grievances to be redressed should be presented in writing with clarity and precision of statement; and, finally, their constant emphasis on the principle that redress of grievances should be the inevitable recompense for a grant.'

Such are some of the results of Mrs. Weske's researches. The documentation is careful, indeed meticulously careful. And the volume contains in the appendices two charts of ecclesiastical assemblies, which are also carefully compiled. There is a satisfying bibliography and an excellent index. The work is all that a good thesis should be.

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE ATONEMENT.

There is a large number of recent books on the subject of the Atonement—last month we dealt with Dr. Vincent Taylor's important work—but there is room for such a study as is presented in Canon W. J. Sparrow Simpson's *The Redeemer* (Longmans; 6s. net). It is an eloquent defence, based on Scripture and the Church's practice, of the traditional view of the Atonement as both a godward sacrifice and a manward appeal; and it is couched in terms such as the lay reader will readily understand. The author has written many books, but we do not recall any book of his which excels this in clearness and vigour of presentation.

It undoubtedly makes a world of difference, as he says, whether a man believes in the Atonement as both a godward sacrifice and a manward appeal or as only a manward appeal. But, as he realizes, popular religion at the present day tends to affirm the manward appeal and to deny the godward sacrifice. In other words, it tends to affirm the subjective side and to deny the objective side of the Atonement. Accordingly, it is his purpose in these pages to urge that in this case, as in so many others, popular religion is right in what it affirms and wrong in what it denies. The Atonement is godward. It is primarily godward and secondarily manward. Its essence lies in the fact that it is the one and only perfect reparation offered to the Eternal Holiness; and that it was offered by the Son of God, who, for that very end, became the Son of man, to accomplish for His creatures what they never could accomplish for themselves.

In appealing to the Scriptures Dr. Sparrow Simpson gives us not so much a series of connected chapters as a series of studies of salient points, such as Isaiah 53 in the Jewish and in the Christian religion, St. John the Baptist on the Lamb of God, and the Cry from the Cross. In particular he dwells upon the Apostolic interpretation of the Crucifixion, in which redemption is variously explained as reconciliation, sacrifice, and priesthood. Nor does he restrict himself to an account of the Apostolic interpretations, but treats of historic interpretations, mediæval and modern; those of Anselm, Abelard, and Calvin; of M'Leod Campbell, Denney, and Moberly.

It may be gathered that the book covers much familiar ground. It should, however, be noted that it contains two features which lend it a certain distinction. One is its constructive treatment of the idea of reparation as applied to the death of Christ on the Cross. The reparation did not consist in the suffering of physical pain, or in the fact of the Crucifixion, but was a moral reparation, consisting in the offering on man's behalf of the perfection of sinless sorrow.

The other distinctive feature of the book is the emphasis upon devotional (as compared with intellectual or theological) interpretation. As one would expect of an author who combines evangelical sentiment with Catholic practice, the institution of the Eucharist is regarded as in itself a defence—like the testimony of Scripture—of the objective view of the Atonement. For the Eucharist is the Church's devotional interpretation of the Atonement as primarily not a manward appeal, but an offering presented before the Eternal Holiness. It is sacrificial because the Atonement is sacrificial. The Eucharistic sacrifice perpetuates the Pauline doctrine of redemption. And wherever the ancient doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice prevails, there the sacrifice of the Cross will be brought home to men's minds and hearts.

Those who differ from Dr. Sparrow Simpson in their interpretations of the Atonement cannot but admire the sincerity and consistency of this work.

C. F. ANDREWS.

Mr. C. F. Andrews is a persistent wanderer over sea and land, and in whatever part of the world Indians are to be found they draw him with an irresistible attraction. Some Europeans would describe him as a stormy petrel, always to be found where tempest is threatening. But it would be fairer to emphasize the earnestness with which he has laboured to promote better racial understandings, and the great success he has often had in assembling factors of reconciliation.

In his book *India and the Pacific* (Allen & Unwin; cloth 6s. net, paper 3s. 6d. net), he treats mainly of certain problems connected with Fiji, and is specially concerned with the relations of the Indian immigrants to the Fijians and the Europeans. Despite the fact that he begins by saying that 'there are not many things to encourage us in the world to-day,' the tone of the book is optimistic. He finds that the abolition of the indenture system has meant a great improvement in conditions as compared with those at the time of his previous visit twenty years ago. There are still many things for him to criticise, such as separate electorates, threatened return to nomination instead of election; monopoly by Europeans of the higher posts; relics of feudalism in the contrast between their houses and those of the Indian labourers, etc., but on the whole his criticism is friendly. Only once does he seem to be a little unfair—when, discussing the question of separate versus joint electorates, he explains that the European objection is due to the fear that only the European whom the Indians like would be elected, and goes on to point out that the Europeans could retort by electing the Indian whom they liked best, quite forgetting that the European vote would be so small as to be almost negligible in a joint electorate. Mr. Andrews' fundamental political conviction is that the time has come for the British Empire to shed its imperialism and develop as a commonwealth of nations. He very rightly argues that, if, as he thinks is the case, political power is becoming precarious, there is no limit to the moral and intellectual influence which a European may still exercise. The general position taken up in the book is that 'if the British attempt to retain a virtual oligarchy or dictatorship, they will in the end be excluded, by the opposition of other races, from the larger moral sphere where their influence might still prevail.' This might be said to be true not only of Fiji, but of India also, and other larger portions of the Empire.

Mr. Andrews' excursions into world politics, or, at least, the problems of the Pacific, are interesting. He thinks that the affiliations of northern and western Australia are Asiatic, and that it would be politic for Australia to make friends culturally and economically with India before it is too late. By 'too late' he means that an understanding between Japan, China, and India might cut off Australia completely from the western world and lead to disaster if the old misunderstandings between the European and the Asiatic still persist. Mr. Andrews hopes for reconciliation, and his common-sense treatment of the situation in this book—which it might be said would be all the better of a little pulling together and excision of repetitions—will do much to help towards this end.

THE APOSTOLIC TRADITION.

The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net) has been edited by the Rev. Gregory Dix, Monk of Nashdon Abbey, and is being published for the Church Historical Society. So far the first volume only has appeared. It contains a historical introduction, textual materials, and a translation into English, with an *apparatus criticus* and some critical notes. The second volume will conclude the work, and will contain the Introduction and Commentary. If it fulfils the scholarly promise which the first volume indicates, the whole will be a valuable contribution towards a full understanding of Hippolytus' significant treatise. Professor Easton's recent translation has been very useful, but on certain textual points this work may correct Professor Easton's, and it will otherwise supplement it.

The little Greek treatise whose title is the *Apostolic Tradition* was issued at Rome by the anti-Pope and martyr St. Hippolytus about A.D. 215. It claims to be an accurate account of the inner life and religious policy of the Christian Church of the sub-Apostolic Age. It deals first with the institution of the various ranks of the Christian hierarchy, then with the initiation of the laity, and finally with what the editor calls 'The Devout Life for Normal Christians.'

The editor gives in the general introduction an account of Hippolytus in his relations with his rival Callistus, in which the former's character does not appear in a good light. There is little doubt but that Hippolytus suffered from pride and complacency, narrowness and obstinacy, and, in his enmity, malignancy. And the whole story of Hippolytus, which the editor records, tends to raise serious questions about the contents of his treatise. 'How far can we be certain that the usages it describes represent more than the preferences, perhaps exceptional and perverse, of a schismatic individualist? How far back does the "Tradition" go, and to what extent does it represent what was normal in the Great Church in the second century?'

Such are the questions the editor will seek to answer completely in his second volume. Meantime we observe that he thinks he will be able to justify a high degree of confidence in the evidence of Hippolytus, and to show that the 'Tradition' represents the mind and practice not of Hippolytus only but of the whole Catholic Church of the second century. Whether he will succeed in showing that or not, there is no question as to the importance of the 'Tradition' as an illuminating source of evidence.

THE NEW LIFE OF JESUS.

We use the definite article because *The Life of Jesus*, by Mr. Conrad Noel (Dent; 12s. 6d. net), is not simply one among many conventional 'lives.' It is an outstanding performance. In sheer bulk it is remarkable, a volume of over six hundred large-sized pages, with four long appendices, with an elaborate summary of Old Testament history, with sketches of the contemporary scene in Rome and Roman lands, and outlines of the popular religions of the Empire. All this is included in the comprehensive plan, and each item has its contribution to make to the total view. The author has read widely and mastered his material. He writes with distinction and with a freshness and originality which are always a sign that the reflections and conclusions are coming off his own mind. It must be said also that for a person of his religious colour his independence and objectivity are remarkable. No one reading these absorbing pages would have any reason to conclude that Mr. Noel is a priest of the 'English Catholic Church,' which presumably means what is generally known as 'Anglo-Catholic.'

It is, however, in accord with the writer's considered aim. He has had before him a double purpose, to be objective and to be historical, *i.e.* to write always with the background in view. So far as the first of these aims is concerned he has achieved a considerable, but by no means complete, success. In an appendix he gives us examples of the 'subjective' Christ depicted by certain writers, the Sabbatarian Christ, the Total-abstainer Christ, the Vegetarian Christ and the Pacifist Christ. He might have added the Apocalyptic Christ. He himself presents what, without very much straining, might be called the Economic Christ. His political (or social) sympathies are obvious, and he has allowed them to affect his general picture of Jesus, and to colour his interpretation of certain incidents. An extreme instance of this is the revolutionary opinions of Mary as seen in the *Magnificat* and the influence she had in forming similar opinions on Jesus, the Baptist, and James, 'if Mary had some share in the education of all three.' Another is his paraphrase of what Jesus meant, in the Parable of the Rich Fool, by 'Who made me a judge or a divider over you?' as follows: 'What have I to do with your petty squabbles about private property? My business is with a world where all essential property will be held in common, and there will be found to be not only enough, but plenty for all.' In the first temptation of Jesus, the writer tells us, it was the food problem that was before Jesus. And in His general outlook the Kingdom He meant to found was a better world for all.

With regard to the other point, Mr. Noel very properly sees the ministry of Jesus against the background of His day. And this background is sketched with great fullness. But much that is given us here, while of great interest and value in itself, seems to have little relevance to the work or ideas of Jesus. The elaborate narrative of Old Testament story is to a large extent superfluous. The account of Oriental religions does not seem essential to an understanding of the mind of Jesus. And even the picture of ordinary life under the Roman tyranny has a limited application. It is only fair to say that the writer has gone into these matters with some fullness in order to show that the teachings of Jesus were given under much the same conditions as obtain in our modern world and cannot be asserted to be inapplicable to it.

The outstanding feature of this brilliant account of Jesus and His teaching is the assertion and prolonged proof that Jesus intended to found a social commonwealth of justice for all. This is the meaning of the Kingdom of God and it was the main conception in the mind of Jesus. This raises two questions: First, *was* the Kingdom actually the ruling thought in our Lord's mind? And secondly, was the Kingdom that Jesus had in His mind to be a commonwealth or a spiritual reality in the soul, the reign of God in His children? With regard to the first question, it may be reasonably argued that the main thought of Jesus was not the Kingdom but the Fatherhood of God, and that the Kingdom was simply the inherited framework in which Jesus put this governing faith. The second question is more difficult. Mr. Noel argues strongly and with conspicuous ability for the idea of the Kingdom as a commonwealth, a better world of equality and fairness and plenty. He devotes two chapters to the saying of Jesus: 'The Kingdom of God is within, or among, you.' He holds that 'within' is impossible, and that 'among' confirms the idea of an organized community. A great wealth of learning is devoted to showing that the background of the idea in the Old Testament and Apocalyptic confirms this conclusion. And at any rate it may be said that he has made a case which all future interpreters will have to consider.

It must not be thought, however, that this book is an essay on the teaching of Jesus about social welfare. Mr. Noel gives us a month by month, sometimes a week by week, narrative of the life and ministry of our Lord. Nearly half of the book is devoted to the evangelic story, and the story is told vividly and arrestingly. There is not a dull or conventional page in the whole of it. The writer differs from Rawlinson and the Form-critics in holding that a chronological account of the life of Jesus is possible, and that Mark can be taken as a sound basis for this. And we think he is right. But no one, if he has strong convictions, could write the story of Jesus without raising questions of interpretation on which differences are inevitable. We have marked at least half a dozen of such points on which violent contradictions will be offered by others to his conclusions. But this only shows how individual and independent the writer is.

A word must be added on two points. The book is beautifully dressed, with good clear type and attractive binding. And the seven maps are well drawn and very helpful.

A MASTER OF PREACHING.

That Principal Macgregor has published a new volume of sermons is already known to the readers of this Magazine, for in last month's 'Christian Year' they enjoyed the leading ideas in his study of Hag $2^{3.\,9}$. In those spacious days when many volumes of sermons appeared, a volume by Principal Macgregor was an outstanding event; how much more is this so to-day when the number of sermon volumes is so much less. In *Christ and the Church* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net) he deals with twenty-eight great subjects in the way that we have learned to expect—deep penetrating thought and fine restrained writing. Here is his message to those who would narrow the Church:

'Anthony Trollope did not pose as anything but what he was—a bluff, hearty, sport-enjoying Englishman, yet in one place he exclaims, "We are not forced into Church? No, but we desire more than that—we desire not to be forced to stay away." That is a saying to be seriously pondered, for though men indifferent too often lay the responsibility for their irreligion on the pious, yet this fact remains, that amongst the indifferent there are creatures with vastly more of religious interest than they realize. They do believe in goodness, and in their hearts they reach after it; but the Church when they approach it does not seem manly or plain enough. The penitence in its expression sounds morbid and excessive; the virtues exalted by the preacher are not those which they most admire. They come seeking bread, and, in its place, they are offered a haze of pious words. Yet surely in the religion of Jesus there are realities to match their deep desire—helps, teachings, duties, inspirations; and the Church which is true to the Lord, who had thought for the sheep outside this fold, ought less narrowly to consider the taste and the restrictions of the few within. The Church of Jesus should be a place very lightsome and very large, hospitable, elastic, varied, adventurous, so that men of every temper may find a home within its walls. "My house," He says, "shall be called a house of prayer for all nations"—that is a great and rebuking word to which we do well to give heed.'

AN AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGIST OF RELIGION.

The Psychology of Religious Living (Cokesbury Press; $2.50), by Karl R. Stolz, Ph.D., D.D., Dean of Hartford School of Religious Education, contains

See review also in issue of the Expository Times,
Jan 1938 page 147, – Noel's rule [illegible]

the substance of lectures delivered in several theological seminaries, universities, and summer schools conducted for ministers and laymen. It is an attempt on the part of one who has done clinical work in mental hygiene and therapy, and has had practical experience with undeveloped or disorganized individuals, 'to explore the psychological fundamentals of religious personality.'

Part I. treats of the Backgrounds of the Religious Quest, and the questions it raises are such as the following: What constitutes religion? How did it originate? How has the idea of God been evolved? Is humanism a religion? How has the psychology of religion arisen, and what are its methods of investigation?

The expositions are useful and the author is well read in the recent literature. Naturally he refers chiefly to the literature produced on his side of the Atlantic, but he appears to have missed some recent contributions of significance by writers on this side, such as Malinowski and Marett. The former's views on the relation between magic and religion merit at least a hearing, and we are not sure that the latter's use of the term 'animatism' has been rightly grasped. Malinowski has written much since 1922, and Marett a great deal since 1909.

Part II. deals with Religious Experience and Personality, and here the author moves in that practical field in which he is so deeply interested. The questions arising here are many and various, like the subjects treated. The chapters to which one most readily turns are those in which such subjects are treated as conversion, personality, control, prayer, worship, occultism, and mental health.

Take one of those subjects, that of prayer, which, as the author says, 'is either the grossest form of superstition or the culmination of wisdom.' We pass over his discussion of 'subjective prayer,' the answers to which are resident within the soul of him who prays, and turn to his discussion of 'objective prayer,' the answers to which—if and when given—influence other persons or effect changes in the external world. Prayer of the first type, 'personal objective prayer,' may possibly be answered sometimes by direct divine action, but the author hastens to add that such a question lies outwith the domain of the science of psychology. It is a question for the philosopher and theologian. As for 'impersonal objective prayer,' he allows here no loophole for validity. Indeed he affirms it to be sinful to attempt to change God's established order.

Here is a quotation which will give an impression of the style of the book, which abounds in the terminology of recent psychology, and at the same time indicates the author's view of prayer: 'When the individual has lost confidence in the power of prayer to protect fruit trees in a critical stage against the usual ravages of a severe frost, he may still with the utmost assurance offer the prayer of aspiration and thereby reach a higher level of personality integration, offer the prayer of consecration and thereby dedicate himself to the implications of a fresh outlook, offer the prayer of submission in the day of tribulation and thereby absorb an otherwise disrupting experience, offer the prayer for guidance and thus sensitize conscience and unify life in terms of duty or manifest destiny.' But if prayer is to be thus interpreted in psychological terms, many will be inclined to ask, Why pray? Why use the name of God? Why not simply wish or will?

In *Swords or Plowshares?* (Abingdon Press; $2.00) the Rev. Earl Cranston, Ph.D., writes on 'How can war be avoided now and permanently.' It is a book addressed in the first instance to Americans, but it contains many wholesome truths not only for the U.S.A. but for the nations generally. The writer examines the history of the American people to discover what the various wars in which they have engaged have accomplished, and whether some better way than war might not in each case have been found. Not every one will agree with his analysis, but it is pleasing to note his sympathetic and understanding treatment of Britain's aims and policy. Perhaps he has not made sufficient allowance for the apparently uncontrollable and dæmonic element in world affairs which baffles statesmanship, and seems to work like an inevitable doom. One feels it somewhat facile to suggest that some happy word or the transfer of a few votes would easily have been sufficient to alter fate. The book, however, is a careful historical record, full of instruction and wise guidance for all citizens who ponder the supreme problem of world peace.

If any one desires a plain statement of the old Reformation theology we can commend, *The Christian Evangel*, by Principal John M'Nicol, D.D. (American Tract Society; New York; $1.50). It is a piece of solid workmanship closely following the lines of New Testament teaching. In the sub-title it is called 'a modern restatement of the ancient faith,' but there is nothing distinctively modern about it. There are no references whatsoever to modern thought and practically no illustrations. The writer has confined himself to the one task of giving a systematic exposition of Bible teaching as that is understood in evangelical circles. In this task he has attained a very considerable measure of success.

In the Church of Scotland Youth series a book for Bible Classes has been issued on *The Making of a Christian*, by the Rev. George M. Dryburgh, M.A. (Church of Scotland Committee on Publications; 1s. 6d. net). It deals with the relation of youth to all sorts of factors, like money, leisure, work, friendship, the mind, the body, home, prayer, Sunday, the Church. Questions for discussion are supplied after each chapter. The work is intelligently done. The style is perhaps rather condescending, and there is not a sufficient emphasis on social problems like housing and poverty, the real things that trouble (or ought to trouble) youth. But the book will be a help to leaders of young people's societies or classes.

One of the signs which indicate a welcome recovery of interest in the Bible, and especially in the Old Testament, is the appearance of so many sound popular books about it. To the existing list we must now add *The Old Testament To-day*, by the Rev. W. L. Northridge, M.A., B.D., Ph.D. (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net). Here we have a useful and workmanlike Introduction to the Old Testament, treating the subject along familiar lines and with the usual divisions. Dr. Northridge writes in a clear fashion, putting his material into a form which the lay reader can easily grasp. His tone is modest; he makes less claim to scholarship than he might have done, and is content for the most part to cite the opinions of others, sometimes without offering a decision between rival views. He has made himself a master of the modern position, and has made good use of the most recent standard works. He has thus produced a comprehensive survey of the Old Testament from the literary point of view, well adapted to the type of reader for whom it is intended. There is a useful Bibliography, to which, however, one or two books may well be added. Lods' two volumes, in Hooke's translation, certainly deserve mention, for instance, and Miss Allen's 'Short Introduction to the Old Testament' and Welch's 'Visions of the End' should certainly not have been omitted from their respective sections.

A perfectly charming book for parents, teachers, children, and everybody is *Manners Can be Fun*, written and drawn by Mr. Munro Leaf (Hamish Hamilton; 3s. 6d. net). It is a thin, large book about the size of Struwelpeter, and just as funny. Every page has a 'manner' in large black type, and a drawing to illustrate it. The drawings are 'primitive,' such as a child would draw if he had humour and genius. The book as well as the manners is good fun.

The Good News of Luke the Physician (Lutterworth Press; 3s. 6d. net), with commentary, by the Rev. P. N. F. Young, M.A., is an edition of the Third Gospel on comparatively novel lines. There is a short Introduction to the Third Gospel, in which the late Dr. Streeter's critical positions are endorsed. This is followed by an English version, which keeps close to the Authorized and Revised Versions, arranged in chapters and paragraphs, with the verse numbers in the margin. Then comes a Commentary of some three hundred pages in length, clearly spaced out and written in a style at once interesting, clear, and consecutive. The standpoint is both conservative and modern (in the sense of being adopted in view of modern literary and historical criticism), and the book may be commended as suitable for use in schools and colleges where acquaintance with the original Greek text is not required.

The Approaching Advent of Christ (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 6s. net), by the Rev. Alexander Reese, is an examination of the teaching of J. N. Darby and his followers. To many this must be an unfamiliar name, and it may surprise them to be told that the Separatist Movement which he initiated has spread to the remotest corners of the earth, enlisting supporters in most of the Reformed Churches in Christendom—among Evangelical Anglicans, Fundamentalists, Plymouth Brethren (whose founder was J. N. Darby), free-lance Bible teachers, and evangelists, and all whose leanings are toward 'a realistic programme of the End.' Mr. Reese, who serves an American Presbyterian Mission in Brazil, buckles to his task with good will, being persuaded—curiously enough, many will think—that these prophetic theories should be subjected to thorough examination. It is no use, as he says, bowling to Bradman, or pitching to 'Babe' Ruth, with a ping-pong ball, and against the wind!

He first states the orthodox pre-millennial view, which is traceable to the close of the Apostolic Age, then summarizes the doctrine of the new school of pre-millennialists, which arose about 1830, and then investigates the teaching of Scripture on the resurrection of the saints and kindred topics. Meeting the Darbyists on their own ground, and summoning the accredited commentators to his aid, he shows how ill-founded are the characteristic Darbyist theories. He does not think that the Brethren need relinquish all that Darby taught for 'their and our good,' but they should relinquish only what was not derived from Scripture—'from refining what the Bible left rugged, and meant to remain rugged.'

It is Hard to be a Christian, by Rev. Samuel M. Zwemer, D.D. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 3s. 6d.), contains about a dozen addresses, some of which have been given at religious conferences in England and America. They form a wholesome change from much of the religious writing of to-day in respect of the fact, hinted at in the title, that they stress the reality and power of sin, and the sterner aspects of the Christian life. The writer's theology is that of John Bunyan, and he acknowledges indebtedness to Bishop Andrews, Alexander Whyte, and George Matheson. That is not to say that he is unfamiliar with more modern thought, but he looks on life with serious eyes in the light of the Cross, and finds that salvation is no easy thing. As the Sadhu Sundar Singh once remarked to the writer, 'Those who think that salvation from sin will come easily have no strength to abandon sin; but those who realize that God became incarnate and shed His blood to save us from our sin, will not do that which gives suffering to God, or to a brother in Christ.'

The name of Mr. A. J. Russell, the author of 'For Sinners Only,' on the cover of a book is doubtless enough to assure it of a widespread welcome. And there is much to interest and inspire in his latest book, *Healing in His Wings* (Methuen; 5s. net). It professes to be the biography of a spiritual healer who is simply named Dorothy, but it can hardly be called a biography. The central figure is presented with a somewhat provoking elusiveness, and only glimpses and hints are given of her life and work. One fails to see why this air of mystery should be thrown around the subject. There is also evidence of padding, as when we are told at some length of a 'princess' who called a meeting and forgot all about it, and of the author bumping over rabbits when motoring to Stranraer. At the same time it is manifest that 'Dorothy' is a remarkable character and a gifted healer. What is written here of her home of healing and of her religious experiences is very beautiful and inspiring.

The Childhood of Jesus, by Miss Geraldine Cummins, with a Preface by Mr. Eric Parker (Frederick Muller; 5s. net), is another of those imaginative reconstructions of Scripture story which are becoming increasingly common. It is praised by the publishers as 'unique,' and by Mr. Eric Parker as 'beautiful,' and doubtless both adjectives have some truth to back them. It all depends on whether you like this kind of thing. There are hints and suggestions in the Gospels that can be used to build up a picture of the child Jesus on substantial foundations. But this book, interesting and even fascinating as it is in some ways, is to a very large extent sheer imagination. With this caveat, we may say that the writer has done her best to present a life-like figure and has largely succeeded.

Saul of Tarsus, by the Rev. F. Warburton Lewis (Nicholson & Watson; 6s. net), is a sequel to the same writer's 'Jesus of Galilee,' and has been written in response to many requests from readers of the earlier work. It is a picture of St. Paul, or rather a series of pictures, mainly of his spiritual life and development, in the setting of the events of his career. The book is based on the work of Professor Ramsay, to whom the writer expresses his indebtedness. 'Saul of Tarsus' is hardly an accurate title, since all through it is the Christian that is in view. But those who enjoyed 'Jesus of Galilee' will be satisfied with this portrayal of His great servant. It is all vivid and alive. It professes not to be a 'hand-book' or a 'biography.' It is rather pictorial and revealing, and aims at showing the real stature of the Apostle as a witness and servant of his Lord, and in this aim the writer achieves a considerable success.

At Christmas time those who want calendars with a religious message, and books for boys and girls that combine well-written stories with religious teaching naturally turn to Messrs. Pickering & Inglis.

We draw attention to the calendars and almanacs. They are the *Golden Grain Wall Calendars*, all with brightly coloured pictures. They are in tear-off block form, and have a selected Scripture text for every day. There are the following varieties: *Daily Manna* (1s.), *Grace and Truth* (1s.), *Young Folks* (1s.), *Daily Grain* (1s. 3d.), *Golden Text* (1s. 3d.), *Daily Meditation* (1s. 6d.). The *Golden*

Grain Almanac is published in two sizes—pocket size (2d.) and large type (3d.).

Turn now to the books. We have three for younger boys and girls. *Under New Management*, by Mr. Raymond H. Belton (1s. 3d.), is an account of a club formed by two small boys and two small girls. Nothing but mischief was done at first, but presently the club fell under new management. In *Accidents will Happen*, by Miss Winifred M. Pearce (1s. 3d.), the twin sons of an archæologist have many adventures, especially Michael who goes with his father to Iraq. The hero of *Danny and the Alabaster Box*, by Miss Constance Savery (9d.), is a small boy with a large missionary interest. Danny gradually gathers enough money to fill the alabaster missionary box. For older boys and girls Messrs. Pickering & Inglis have published *Twelve Clever Girls*, by Mr. J. A. W. Hamilton (1s.). It gives an account of the work of Elise Sandes, the soldiers' friend, and Agnes E. Jones, the workhouse reformer, among others. And *Pioneer Days in Darkest Africa*, by Mr. Arthur G. Ingleby (2s. 6d.), is a biography of Charles Albert Swan, a missionary for years in the heart of darkest Africa. This book has a good map and a number of illustrations. If you must choose, and you are twelve or over, this is the volume for you.

Mrs. Anne Byrd Payson chanced to read 'The Christ of the Indian Road,' and was inspired by it to work out a technique of the Christian life for herself. This was the source of her book 'I Follow the Road.' Now she has written a sequel—*Rule of the Road* (Putnam; 3s. 6d. net)—in which she describes the help given through this technique to others. Many people who had read her first book wrote to her for guidance. Some of her dealings with them are recounted here at length. There is no mention of 'The Oxford Group' here, but the book is on the lines of its work. The stories are told very frankly, and they are all very interesting and enlightening. Mrs. Payson's main demand is for the spirit of forgiveness. It is through this we are really united to the life of Christ. If you have any one you dislike or despise or 'bar,' you must get rid of this attitude if you are to get peace and power in Christ. There is a real originality and freshness about this book which come from its being first-hand and really alive.

A remarkable book, *Church Music in History and Practice*, by Winfred Douglas, Mus. Doc., Canon of Denver, is published by Messrs. Scribner's Sons Ltd. This volume is in the series of the Hale Lectures publications. The Rev. Charles Hale, Bishop of Cairo, died in 1900, and in his Will he provided a fund to be held in trust for the general purposes of promoting the Catholic Faith by lecture courses, one of the subjects to be Church Music.

The volume under review covers the history of Church Music from its Hebrew and Classic basis to the present time. The subject is divided into the following sections: (1) Music of the Eucharist in Plain Song; (2) Evolution of Polyphony; (3) Gregorian Psalmody; (4) Post-Reformation Office Music; and lastly, Pre-Reformation and Post-Reformation Hymnody. The book is a mine of scholarship. It is not a volume for the general reader but for the expert.

Worship and Prayer (S.P.C.K.; paper 2s., cloth 3s. net), by Mr. Hugh Caiger, consists of Fifty-Two Talks to Young People. It belongs to the series of S.P.C.K. Educational Books. The author has already expounded the Church Catechism in Fifty-Two Lessons, and we commend this similar venture to the notice of Sunday-school and Bible-class teachers. He seeks here to explain why one should attend public worship, and how to make both corporate worship and bedside-prayers a spiritual education. Everything is simply and clearly said, and there is a wealth of apposite illustration. Appended to the Talks on Worship and Prayer are Talks for Advent, Christmas, Lent, Easter, and Whitsunday.

A sequel to 'Aims and Ideals of Christian Living' is provided in *The Modern Pilgrimage*, Forty Lessons for Bible Classes, Youth Groups, and Study Circles, by various contributors, edited by the Rev. J. R. Lumb, M.A., and introduced by Dr. Rawlinson, Bishop of Derby (S.P.C.K.; paper, 2s. 6d., cloth, 3s. 6d. net). This book is not meant to provide ready-made lessons, but rather to help in getting young men and women to think about the great matters of faith and action. It begins with two sections on what may be called Revelation (the Psalms and the Life of our Lord), followed by a section on the Prayer Book. From these subjects we pass to the problems of to-day, and then to the Christian life in its various aspects (at work, at play, at home, and so on). A section on four marks of the Christian life includes freedom, authority, conscience, and vocation. And the volume concludes with six chapters on 'Torch-bearers'—Patrick, Eliot, Patteson, Mary Bird, Pao-Swen, and Bishop Azariah. It will be apparent that there is plenty of food for thought here, and when it is added that among the contributors are Miss Dorothy Batho, Miss E. M. Fox, and others nearly as distinguished it will be equally apparent that there is plenty of stimulus also. The Bishop gently criticises Miss Fox for taking the Gospel of Mark as a reliable chronological guide to the life of Christ. In spite of his great authority, we venture to think that Miss Fox is on perfectly sound lines here.

It is an evidence of the interest in religion among the youth of our time that so many books come from the press which deal with the subject as a living problem and aim at giving the young a workable faith. Such a book is *Making Religion Real*, by Rev. Leslie J. Tizard, B.A., B.D., B.Litt. (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net). After showing the perils and loss involved in a desire for indiscriminate experiences, the writer goes on to deal with the need for purpose in life, for getting down to the reality of things, for moral decision and personal service. The style is direct and forceful, the argument lucid and aptly illustrated. It is a book of very sane Christian guidance for the young.

Dr. F. J. Rae is well known as a devout and experienced teacher of Scripture. Through his contact with students and his work in the training of teachers he is exceptionally well placed to understand the problems that arise in keen young minds in regard to the Bible. He has now published an excellent little book—*The Bible Teacher's Difficulties* (S.C.M.; 3s. net)—in which he deals in a simple and straightforward way with leading difficulties. Topics discussed are such as: Is the Bible the Word of God? Why teach the Old Testament? Can we trust the Gospels? Miracles and the Virgin Birth. It is not to be expected that his solutions will satisfy every reader, but every one will be conscious of the scrupulous fairness and judicial balance of the statements, of the tender regard for the conscience of others, and of the writer's own devoutness of spirit and ardent love of truth. The book should prove helpful to many.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By the Reverend J. W. Jack, D.D., Glenfarg, Perthshire.

The remarkable discoveries being made at Lachish by Mr. J. L. Starkey continue to throw an interesting light on the worship and customs of the Israelites. They show that this city was a stronghold of heathen practices, a fact which is in accord with the Biblical references (cf. 2 Ch 25[27], Mic 1[13]). The tombs belonging to the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. reveal a preponderance of Egyptian paganism. Amulets of Egyptian deities have been found in large numbers, affording evidence that the household gods of Egypt, such as Bes, Ptah-Soker, Isis, Bast, and others, enjoyed the popular confidence. Many pottery figurines of the Mother goddess (the 'Queen of Heaven,' cf. Jer 7[18]) have also been unearthed. The beautifully polished seal (believed to date from about 600 B.C.), which we mentioned in a previous article, contains in its upper register two pagan emblems, namely, the figures of a winged serpent and the 'ankh' or Egyptian life-sign, and in its lower register—strange to say—the orthodox names Shefatiah and Asiah, both of which are compounded with the name of Yahweh. There seems to have been no return to true religion in post-Exilic times, for a solar shrine belonging to this period has been discovered in the city. Not far from it was a square limestone altar, evidently used for incense, and containing on one side the figure of a bearded man with upraised arms and on the other a large human hand in relief—two symbols which are known to be almost exclusively associated with the solar cult. Apparently, there were numerous adherents of this heathen worship in the city at this time (as there were at Jerusalem also, cf. Ezk 8[15. 16]), and there must have been considerable religious laxity throughout all the period of the monarchy, giving ample provocation for the prophetic denunciation of Judah.

Among other discoveries in Lachish have been groups of basins or large cup-holes in the limestone rock, with connecting channels between them. These were used, it is believed, for crushing the berries from the numerous olive groves, whose grey-green foliage and silver sheen (cf. Ps 52[8], Jer 11[16], Hos 14[6]) covered the neighbouring hills until Nebuchadrezzar cut the groves down (in 588 B.C.) and piled the wood against the city, to set fire to it. Stores of olives have been found among the ruins of the conflagration, showing that the production of olive oil was one of the main industries of the inhabitants, the oil being used for many purposes, including cooking, anointing, lighting, and heating. As the berries ripen in the autumn and are gathered in November, the stores go to show that the city must have fallen just after the olive harvest, *i.e.* in December, 588 B.C., and that the Lachish Letters, which were found among the ashes and soot, and which belong to Zedekiah's reign (not Jehoiakim's), must be dated to that year (Jerusalem fell the following July, after eighteen months' siege, Jer 39[2]). Among the ruins of the houses the excavators have also found the remains of old wooden looms, with piles of loom weights made of clay, as well as several dyeing-vats, giving evidence of the weaving and dyeing of cloth. Proofs of the existence of these industries have been found in other cities, such as Mizpah, and it is clear that linen and woollen garments were in common use. We read in the story of Samson (Jg 16[13ff.]), which is undoubtedly a legend of great antiquity, how Delilah, seated on the ground beside her horizontal loom (fastened to the ground with pegs), with Samson's head upon her knees (v.[19]), used his flowing locks as weft, and wove them into the warp of her loom. In connexion with clothing it is interesting to note that several toggle pins, made with copper and the centre pierced with an eye, have been unearthed in the city. These seem to have been used for fastening the cloak or outer garment, and date from Hyksos times (*c.* 2000 B.C.).

At the great mound of Megiddo, the expedition of the Oriental Institute of Chicago University (directed by Gordon Loud) has succeeded in making important discoveries in the palace, once a magnificent building, dating from about 1550 B.C., and commanding a superb unobstructed view of the whole plain reaching to the sea. They have found an ante-room paved with mosaics of sea-shells set in lime, and some interior walls covered with frescoes in brilliant blue, red, green, brown, and yellow. In that part of the building belonging to stratum VIII. (1479–1350 B.C.) their work has been rewarded by the finding of a hoard of jewellery beneath the plaster floor of a room, with numerous objects of gold, electrum, ivory, and lapis lazuli, including a fine fluted gold bowl in the shape of a sea-shell, cosmetic jars of serpentine and hæmatite, and a gold mesh chain which is as strong and flexible to-day as it was over three thousand three hundred years ago. Who placed the hoard there? Evidently a prince or his trusted servant, desperately in fear of some threatened invasion, had taken this precaution to safeguard his cherished treasures, which were probably gifts from Egyptian and Asiatic rulers. Was the invasion that of Joshua and the Habiru (Sa-Gaz) *c.* 1400 B.C.? Perhaps, but at all events the owner's treasures were undiscovered, and he never lived to reclaim them. The excavators have also found in a subterranean three-room vault or treasury an invaluable collection of carved and incised ivories, over two hundred pieces altogether—the most comprehensive group yet known of such art in the thirteenth century B.C. A few of them bear hieroglyphic inscriptions, many of them have Bes figures, sphinxes, and lotus designs, and some, if not all, of them had served as inlay in furniture, as was the custom in wealthy houses (cf. Ahab's 'ivory' palace, and Ps 45[8]). One is a beautiful oval gaming board, inlaid with gold. All these carved ivories scattered over the land were probably the work of a school of Phœnician craftsmen, who had introduced motifs and patterns in vogue in neighbouring countries.

The striking excavations still being conducted at Tepe Gawra (a few miles north-east of Nineveh) continue to produce a startling commentary on the life and work of early man. Here, in a huge mound containing originally more than twenty strata, the deposits belonging to the fifth millennium B.C.—the earliest recognized civilization so far in the ancient world—have been reached. They take us back three thousand years before Abraham. Even in the remains of this distant age the excavators have found building designs of faultless balance, along with beautiful painted pottery. The best examples of the pottery have been reproduced in their original colours by the artist of the expedition. To obtain his reds, he was actually able to utilize some lumps of red ochre which were lying beside the pottery—the very material that the pre-historic artist had employed countless ages ago and seemed to have left for the excavator of to-day. In the small temple at Khafaje, near Tepe Gawra, one of the most interesting objects found is an excellent bronze cast of two figures wrestling. The men, with their arms outstretched, are grasping each other by the girdles, close to the thighs, and the picture, though dating a thousand years before Jacob, reminds us forcibly of this patriarch's wrestling with a mysterious stranger at Peniel (Gn 32^{24}), when his thigh was strained in the contest.

Further remarkable discoveries have been made at ancient Mari (the capital of the Middle Euphrates), which was captured and burned by Hammurabi, King of Babylon, in 2034 B.C. Two of these may be referred to here. First, in the temple has been found the statue of a goddess, holding a jar or vase close to her body below the waist. The statue, which is nearly five feet high, is hollow and so made that water can enter a duct behind from some exterior reservoir placed at a sufficient height, and this causes a constant living stream to gush forth from the mouth of the jar. The goddess is adorned with a six-fold necklace, and three bracelets on each wrist, and is clothed in a long robe. We have here, no doubt, the origin of the idea of life-giving waters issuing from a divinely filled being, and an apt illustration of the words of Christ, 'Out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water' (Jn 7^{38}). It has generally been understood that Christ was thinking of the rock in the wilderness, but this ancient statue from Mesopotamia shows that the precise idea referred to by Him was in existence in much older times and prevalent throughout the Semitic world. Second, the discovery of the archives of Mari, consisting of many thousands of tablets dating from the reign of the last King, Zimri-Lim (*c.* 2030 B.C.), is leading to a reconstruction of Mesopotamian history in the patriarchal age. They speak of no less than fifty kings, ten of whom are stated to have been allies of Hammurabi, and they give a vivid impression of the constant correspondence that went on among them. In one communication, addressed to Zimri-Lim, Hammurabi refers to a letter he had received from 'the prince of Ugarit' (Ras Shamra). When we reflect that Babylon was about seven hundred miles from this Syrian town, we can form some idea of the enormous distances covered by couriers bearing their tablets. In addition to Haran, a Biblical town which frequently figures in the correspondence is Naḥur (the 'city of Naḥor,' Gn 24^{10}), to which Abraham sent his servant to find a wife for Isaac. Until lately, the Biblical expression 'city of Naḥor' was understood to mean Haran, but the Mari tablets distinguish the two. Indeed, Naḥur is mentioned in the Cappadocian tablets and in the Assyrian contracts from the fourteenth century B.C. (it appears in late Assyrian times as Til-Naḥiri).

The valuable information being afforded by tablets, which are now being uncovered in thousands in various parts of the Near East, is rapidly changing our views of ancient civilization there. At Atchana, near Antioch in Syria, in a level dated about 1400 B.C., a number have lately been brought to light by Sir Leonard Woolley. Two of these belong to the same series as some found at Ras Shamra, while one is a royal letter of about the time of Pharaoh Akhenaten (1383–1366 B.C.), showing that there were archives of royal and official correspondence at this place. At a lower level, dated about 1600–1500 B.C., containing the oldest Hittite buildings yet found in Syria, parts of large cuneiform tablets have been unearthed, and Sir Leonard thinks that we may expect important literary texts here. It is known that these older tablets give us the terms of a treaty of alliance between the King of Atchana and the 'King of the Hurrian tribes,' and as this is the earliest reference to these important people (believed to be the 'Horites' of the Old Testament) a new field of knowledge may be opened up regarding them. At Ras Shamra, where so many tablets have been found bearing on the old Testament, many additional ones, dating about 1400–1350 B.C., some in cuneiform and others in the alphabetic script, have been discovered in the eighth campaign recently finished. These confirm the view that the cuneiform (Babylonian) was generally used for legal and commercial documents, and for official communications with foreign countries, while the alphabetic script was employed in the internal affairs of the town and by the royal family in their private correspondence. Among the alphabetic tablets there are lists, with names, of the employees and servants connected with the temple, and the religious beneficiaries. From these lists we take the following names which occur in the Old Testament (these are in addition to those already mentioned by us, June 1936):

Ezl. Cf. Uzal, Gn 10^{27}, 1 Ch 1^{21}, etc. (probably from root אזל, 'to go away').

Eḫy. Cf. Eḥi, one of the sons of Benjamin, Gn 46^{21}.

Elt. Identical with Elah, the name of one of the Kings of Israel, and other individuals (cf. 'Anath and 'Anah in Old Testament).

'Bd. Cf. 'Ebed ('the servant'), Jg 9^{26}, etc.

'Bdy. Cf. 'Obadiah (Hebrew 'Obadyah), 1 K 18^{3}, etc., the *y* here being probably the Yahweh ending.

'Zn. Cf. 'Azzan (Nu 34^{26}).

Qqln. Cf. Hab 2^{16}, where a Hebrew word *qîqâlôn* occurs, whose meaning is doubtful (translated 'shameful spewing' in A.V., and 'foul shame' in R.V.).

Ynḥm. From the Hebrew root *nḥm*, to which belong several well-known names in the Old Testament, such as Naḥum, Menaḥem, Neḥemiah, etc. The name *Ynḥm* is identical with *Yanḫamu* in the el-Amarna Tablets.

*Yp*ʻ. Cf. Japhia, Jos 10[3], 2 S 5[15], etc.

Some time ago, in the course of quarrying at Hederah, in the plain of Sharon, the headmaster of a neighbouring school discovered a number of oblong earthenware ossuaries (mostly broken in fragments), embedded in a layer of sand about five feet from the surface of the ground. The curious thing is that they are imitations of houses, though hardly two feet high or one foot broad. In shape they are rectangular, and one has a sloping roof, an opening (evidently a door) on one of the narrow sides, and three windows on the other. They have been carefully examined by Professor E. L. Sukenik, and a detailed report on them has now been issued. He places them in the beginning of the fourth millennium B.C. (the Chalcolithic Age), the period of the Ghassûlian culture brought to light near Jericho. The discovery is valuable for several reasons. For one thing, these ossuaries give us the most ancient models of human dwellings that have been found in Palestine or elsewhere in the east, showing that the earliest houses were more or less rectangular in shape. The once accepted theory that at first they were round or semi-circular, then oval, and finally rectangular is upset by this and other discoveries (such as those at Jericho and elsewhere). Further, they prove the existence in these early ages of the belief that death is not the end of life but merely a transformation, the dead being thought of as living in houses or shelters in the other world, much the same as they had lived here. Was Christ making use of this ancient belief when He said, 'In my Father's house are many mansions' (Greek 'abodes')? His statement has usually been connected with the numerous chambers in the Temple at Jerusalem, or the habitations assigned to courtiers within the precincts of palaces, but this discovery at Hederah may offer a better explanation of His words. Further still, as these 'dwellings' enclose bones only, they give evidence that the practice of secondary burial, as adopted by many primitive peoples, was prevalent in Palestine in Chalcolithic times.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Christmas and the Joy of Giving.

By the Reverend John Mowat, M.A., Aberdeen.

'God so loved the world, that he gave.'—Jn 3[16].

Christmas has come round once again—Christmas, that most wonderful season of the year—when every window in the town is crammed with such wonderful toys and things that you can't help flattening your nose against it in the sheer joy of looking at them. A great time, Christmas! like no other time in the year. I wonder what it is in Christmas that makes it so full of happiness? There is a whole lot of things, of course, that do it. There are the parties it brings, when the hall is decorated and you are decorated, and the trees are laden with gifts, and dear old Santa Claus comes, clad in his scarlet cloak. When we are lucky, there's the excitement of frost and snow, with glorious skating and sledging and the building of large snow-men, and we're in a world made white and beautiful in a mantle of sparkling snow. And most of all, there's the thrill of hanging up your stockings and wondering what Santa will bring you—and lying there in the dark, struggling to keep awake, with one ear cocked and one eye just the tiniest little bit open, hoping to see him come down the chimney. And then the next you know it is morning and you have missed him after all—and there's your stocking bulging with the gifts he brought while you slept. And oh! the fun and excitement, as you handle it all over—feel one bulging lump after another, trying to guess what it is! A great time Christmas—a glorious happy time!

And yet I feel that that's not the whole reason why it is so happy. I feel that there's something more in it than that. Once upon a time, away in the beginning of the world, all the rivers of the world met together. The Teviot was there, and the Tweed; the Forth was there, and the Thames; the Ganges was there, and the Brahmaputra; and all the rivers were there. And when the meeting was over, the chairman asked them where they were going and what they were going to do. And the Thames said, 'I am going to a place called London, where I shall be known as the mistress of the rivers of the world.' The Hudson said, 'And I am going to America, and on my banks are going to be great cities, and I shall be the wealthiest river in the world.' The Ganges said, 'And I am going to India, and children will be thrown into my bosom, and I shall be the most sacred river in the world.' But there was one river that did not say a word. 'Who are you?' they asked. 'I am the Nile.' 'And where are *you* going, and what are *you* going to do?' And the Nile said, 'I am going to Africa. There's a desert there, called the Sahara—a huge burning desert—so scorched and parched by the heat of the sun that men cannot live in it, and nothing will grow. And I am going to roll down my waters from the mountains and bring down life from the mountains to the desert. And then I shall flow on into the Mediterranean Sea.' All the other rivers laughed. 'Africa' they said, 'that hot and barren land? Why don't you go to some place worth while?' But the Nile said, 'I will go'; and it went, and gave of its richest and best. And God, sitting on His throne, saw what the Nile had done, and said, 'That is the most beautiful and most holy river in the world.'

And I think that's what makes Christmas so beautiful and so merry and so holy a time in the world's life. It's not because we *get* things, but because we *give* things that it's so happy. Didn't *you* feel that when you brought gifts here to-day? It *cost* you a lot to give up what you brought. You wanted to keep it for yourself—didn't want to give it away. But then you thought of those poor children—so ragged, and cold, and hungry, and uncared for—knowing nothing of the wonder of Christmas, because they are so poor and forgotten. And thinking of them, you said, 'I *will* give it'; and then wrapped it up in brown paper and brought it here to God. It *cost* you something to give it up. But didn't you feel the queer glow at your heart when you gave it—felt happier somehow and better, just because you gave it? That really is what makes Christmas so wonderful. Though it is nice, too, to *get* things, it's because we *give* things to other people that Christmas is so holy and happy. That's why the streets are so busy. Mothers go out buying things, but not for themselves. Staid uncles and aunts openly buy dolls and are not ashamed to be seen buying them—chuckle over daft clock-work toys and buy them—not for themselves but for others. And there's a twinkle in their eyes, and a lurking happiness in their faces which are born of the spirit of Christmas.

The strange thing is that that's why God is so happy too. You remember the beautiful old story? how the shepherds sat round the camp fire watching their sheep by night, and the angels appeared in the sky singing with joy and gladness. It is *not* because God was *getting* something from men that heaven rang with happiness. It was because He was *giving* them something that Christmas night—the most wonderful thing He could give—His only Son Jesus to save and redeem the world. There are some people who feel that God is very stern and terrible—always demanding things from us. The wonder of Christmas is that it tells us of a Manger in Bethlehem, and a little Child wrapped in swaddling clothes—and that God finds His happiness, too, in giving His best and His all.

The Perfect Record.

By the Reverend R. Oswald Davies, Manchester.

'God hath spoken.'—Ps 62^{11}.

I remember once reading an account of the making of a gramophone record. It was made by a party of singers. Three things impressed me which I would like to pass on to you.

1. In the first place, very careful preparation had to be made for the successful making of the gramophone record. When the great day came, the party went to the studio, and there they were led to the recording-room. Soon, the Instructor came in who made all kinds of suggestions. He examined their programme, and cut out certain items. He also speeded up the music. Then, when all was ready, the work of recording began. And when they had come to the end of their work of recording that afternoon, they had actually spent two and a half hours in the recording-room! And yet when the record came later to be reproduced, it lasted for only two minutes and twenty-five seconds. But what careful preparations had to be made.

And is it not so with ourselves? What great preparations have been made for us. Once an American University celebrated its two hundred and fiftieth anniversary. The students marched in a great torchlight procession, and among them were the Freshmen of the College who were only a month old as students. At their head they carried this motto: 'The University has been waiting two hundred and fifty years for us.'

How amused everybody was to see that motto, and yet how true it was. Our homes, our Church and Sunday School, and our day school—all have been prepared for us. And not only have they been prepared for us, but they are there in order that we may prepare ourselves for life. Life needs very careful preparation if it is to be lived aright; we cannot prepare ourselves too carefully. Even the Lord Jesus did that while He was at Nazareth. He was constantly preparing Himself for His great work. We, too, should prepare ourselves that we may live our lives to the glory of God.

2. Then, there was the actual work of recording which was done in an adjoining room. What careful and delicate work it was. First of all, the matrix, that is, the original record, was placed in position. The party was waiting for the signal to begin. First, a white light shone. That called them to attention. Then, a bell rang; it rang once and then a second time. Finally, a red light shone. That said 'Go!' and the party immediately began. But oh, what trouble they had. Matrix after matrix was spoiled. Once a wrong note was struck. Another time, the programme was two seconds too long! And each time they had to begin all over again. In the end, however, the perfect record was made. And how glad they were when they found that in the end the Instructor was satisfied.

We, too, are making a record—it is the record of our life. What kind of record are you making? To make a good record is not an easy matter. Sometimes we strike the wrong note. It may be a fit of bad temper, some untruth we said, or a mean act done to a friend, and that spoiled our record. Our Instructor, who is none other than the Lord Jesus, is not satisfied, and we have to begin all over again. What kind of record did you make last year? I hope it was a good one—better than the record of the previous year. Yet, it can be better still. With the New Year you may start again. The New Year says 'Go!' to you and me. Try again; take another chance; make a better record than you have ever done before.

3. So the party finished their work. They had made their record and felt proud of what they had done. They went away knowing that the record which they had made would be reproduced in thousands of homes in our land. The music which they had sung would be heard again and again, and would gladden men's hearts everywhere.

One thing is certain; it is that our lives can be readily reproduced. Others copy us, and therefore our example counts among our friends. While we are at school or at play, the things we do, and the manner in which we behave are seen by others.

Above all, think of that perfect record of a life—the life of the Lord Jesus—how it has been reproduced. Men and women throughout the centuries have endeavoured to reproduce that life, and owe to Him the secret of their greatness and goodness. Think of the joy and happiness that have been brought to men through Him. Indeed, what better thing can we do also than to copy Him in our own lives?

God spoke in His Son, and it is the most wonderful Word ever spoken to men.

The Christian Year.

Fourth Sunday in Advent.

David: Minstrel, Poet, Saint.

By the Reverend R. W. Stewart, B.D., B.Sc., Killermont.

'Have ye not read what David did?'—Mt 12³.

One day the Pharisees in their carping way said that, because the disciples of Jesus had plucked and rubbed some ears of corn as they passed along a cornfield, they had thus worked on the Sabbath and broken the Commandment. Must it not have been with a smile at the absurd solemnity of these worshippers of ritual and red-tape that Jesus flung this question at them, 'Have ye not read what David did?'

Jesus accepted David in all the legendary glory of his fame. Is it not more wholesome to cherish the memories of heroes than to be adepts in the modern art of 'de-bunking?' Let, for instance, David's example correct narrow notions about religion. The Pharisees were out to make life good and safe by multiplying restrictions that were as impressive as a notice board making a mountain-side 'private.' David was joyous, alive, and free, and knew when a convention was a triviality.

What is it by which a man strikes the popular imagination and wins homage? It may be through some accidental circumstances, such as one American President's rise from humble origins—'from log cabin to White House.' Swift promotion in youth is spectacular and appealing. In the Great War one battalion led into battle by an officer under twenty-one would dare anything at his word. Beauty like that of Helen or Mary, Queen of Scots, takes nations captive. Others rivet attention by sheer genius, like Shakespeare or like Michelangelo, who was painter, poet, sculptor, architect, soldier, engineer. In Francis of Assisi, and Gandhi, and many another instance, the secret is the reverence men give to one they count a saint.

David is one of these charmers. His very name seems to mean 'beloved.' 'Whatsoever the king did,' writes the old chronicler, 'pleased all the people . . . David bowed the hearts of Judah as one man.' By one amazing exploit he took rank with Saul's chief warriors, and presently the shepherd lad was king. He had genius, was soldier, musician, poet. In every situation he 'had a way with him'; he was the hero of the army, the pride of the nation, the ideal friend. And withal religion ran like a golden thread through all the pattern of his life. He was human in his fall yet a saint in his repentance.

1. *David the Minstrel.* Life is poor without music and laughter. 'A merry heart,' says Solomon, 'doeth good like medicine.' 'Men's muscles move better,' writes George Eliot, 'when their souls are making merry music.' Shakespeare's Cæsar dislikes Cassius, for

he loves no plays,
As thou dost, Antony; he hears no music;
Seldom he smiles.

Something is amiss mentally or physically with one who cannot laugh. David though chased for his life by Saul, like a partridge over the hills, could parley with a jest, 'why do you hunt me like a flea?'

It may be that these are natural gifts not in reach of every one. Barrie in *What Every Woman Knows* makes Maggie say wistfully, 'I wish I had charm.' Yet ought there not to be music and laughter in every life that is Christian. Jesus explained the contrast between the gloomy followers of John and His own disciples by the fact that He was with them; and in the birthday of the Church it was a mark of a Christian to be joyful. Why is it that people have tried in the name of religion to suppress the expression of gladness, and have so often thought they were serious when they were merely dull?

True, 'life is real, life is earnest,' and there will always be need to entreat the frivolous and slack to gird up their loins. Yet is there not need, too, to make an appeal to the censorious and interfering, to those suspicious of joy and laughter. If the sense of strain is always felt, then the conviction is lacking that the ultimate triumph of righteousness depends not on one's own little contribution but on God, and is therefore sure. Faith in God makes wholesome laughter possible and delight in innocent pleasures. Life will never be made good by making it bare. The soul cannot be kept clean by keeping it empty. 'Seven devils,' said Jesus, 'will return to the house swept and garnished.'

Have ye not read what David did,
  Who danced before the Lord?
Who strung his harp to melody
  With the hand that swung the sword.

2. *David the Poet.* The touch of poetry is an essential element in a full life. Not that all can be poets—though there must be few who have never in secret tried to turn a rhyme—but all need the sense that life is not just prose.

The drift of pinions, would we hearken,
  Beats at our own clay-shuttered doors.

Romantic lights fall on the most commonplace businesses. A clerk in the stuffy office of a sheep-dip firm deals with letters from Arabian sheiks in the desert who are agents for its tins. It is the artists and poets who open men's eyes to the romance of every day and the eternal beauty of simple and common things. There is need to cultivate sensitiveness to their message, so that, for example, one may come back from a picture gallery not bored but with new visions in the mind of such familiar things as a mother, or a child, or a man following the plough, or a cottage nestling under a hill, so that the heart has a new feeling for the elemental sanctities of life. Or is it some tragic thing like war, sordid, brutal, pitiful, tremendous? Great words are needed for it. David gives them, 'How are the mighty fallen, and the weapons of war perished!'

It is not true that ordinary folk have no use for poetry.

In a concert hall in a home camp shortly before the battle of the Somme some hundreds of cadets, most of whom were to perish in that shambles, were making merry after the long hours of training. At any moment the summons might come to one or all to join a draft, but for that evening care was forgotten in uproarious laughter and song. One turn in the programme, however, was a recitation. And as the great words of Shakespeare rang out a sudden tense, stillness fell on that young audience, and they were carried to heights and depths of thought and feeling as they perceived that the words might have been written for that hour and for themselves.

> If we are mark'd to die, we are enow
> To do our country loss; and if to live,
> The fewer men, the greater share of honour.
> . . . .
> We few, we happy few, we band of brothers.

David was poet as well as musician. For this, too, his people loved him. And loving such as him men may all come to share something of the poet's larger joy in life and keener vision of beauty.

Turn from David for a moment to David's son and Lord. Christ too was a poet. His words rise above prose and calculation, and set things in eternal light. 'There is joy among the angels of heaven over one sinner that repenteth.' Or about the offender of a child—'it were better that a millstone were hanged about his neck and he be drowned in the depths of the sea.' Such words are not prose but poetry, passionate appreciation and disclosure of eternal reality and truth.

3. *David the Saint.*—Again and again the story of David shows how religion is needed if life is not to miss its climax. As the Psalm, possibly his own, quaintly puts it:

> By thee through troops of men I break,
> And them discomfit all;
> And, by my God assisting me,
> I overleap a wall.

In one incident after another religion adds the crowning touch. When the three mighty men handed him the cup of water fetched from the well of Bethlehem at the jeopardy of their lives, the story hangs on the edge of an absurd anti-climax. It would have been to step from the sublime to the ridiculous if David had taken a drink and said, 'Thank you, that is most refreshing.' It is religion that finds the right ending. The gift won by such devotion must be dedicated to Him who alone is worthy to receive it. 'He poured it out unto the Lord.'

When Shimei cursed David how ignobly the story would have continued if there had been a slanging-match across the gully and then a futile chase of angry men up the ravine after a rascal who had too long a start. But how nobly it does continue. 'Let him alone. It may be that the Lord will look on the wrong done unto me and will requite me good.'

In particular, there are two facts about which religion alone has anything adequate to say. There is sin. David once sinned grossly, meanly with intrigue and bloodshed. There was no excuse, and there in shame the story might have had to stop. But David bowed in penitence. He is remembered more for his broken and contrite heart than for his ugly sin. Nothing else could have let that story go on except repentance before God and the breaking in of Divine forgiveness. And in every life there are matters for which there is no remedy and about which no comment or reflection leads anywhere except just this—that for the contrite there is pardon.

And there is death. If David wrote the words of the Shepherd Psalm, religion spoke to him concerning this mystery.

> And in God's house for evermore
> My dwelling-place shall be.

David had all the gifts of genius but the crowning gift was faith. Without this no life is perfect, possessing this every life is blessed. And all the saints bear witness that God offers it alike to monarchs and to common men.

> Have ye not read what David did,
> Who danced before the Lord?
> Who strung his harp to melody
> With the hand that swung the sword.
>
> Have ye not chanted David's dirge
> For his lovely, pleasant friend
> Fall'n on Gilboa's battle heights?
> O glorious, pitiful end!
>
> Have ye not prayed as David prayed,
> Who bowed his kingly head,
> And owned his shame, and took the blame,
> As 'I have sinned,' he said?
>
> Ah! merry hero, poet, saint,
> Aglow with fire divine!
> Thy starry gifts, joy, music, tears,
> Would that they all were mine!
>
> Nay, but one part, the broken heart,
> Is needful, till by grace
> Restored and shepherded, with God
> Shall be my dwelling-place.

CHRISTMAS DAY.

The Triple Sign.

'And this shall be a sign unto you; Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger.'—Lk 2^{12}.

The corroboration of the angels' story was the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger. We who live so long after the shepherds cannot expect to find the same corroboration of the good news of God's love and grace. At the same time, there are signs—not entirely out of relation to that which is spoken of in our text, which do corroborate our faith in the angels' story that 'A Saviour which is Christ the Lord' has been born to us.

1. First there is the sign of the Babe. This is the sign which so far at least corroborates our faith that, when God would exercise saving grace on behalf of the world of men—He sends a baby. It is a method of His. He works through men—and therefore through babies who are the fathers of men. He revolutionizes human thought and action: He brings new direction to human affairs: He changes the character of art, literature, custom, history in this way.

Who was the old scholar of the Middle Ages who, contrary to custom, taught his pupils with no covering for his head? When asked the reason, he replied that it was in honour of the future consuls, poets, philosophers, masters, whom he was teaching. That old scholar knew what God's method is.

As a modern writer has said, 'We fancy that God can only manage His world by big battalions abroad, when all the while He is doing it by little babies at home. When a wrong wants righting, or a truth wants presenting, or a continent wants opening, God sends a baby into the world to do it. That was why, long, long ago, a babe was born at Bethlehem.'

2. The second sign is the sign of the manger. This sign draws attention to the kind of cradles in which the babies who have meant most for the world have been laid. They have not, as a rule, been expensive cradles: but rude and rough, akin to mangers. Such were the cradles of Martin Luther, John Bunyan, Abraham Lincoln, David Livingstone, William Carey, Robert Burns, to name only a few. And to-day men do them reverence because of what they accomplished.

John Bunyan writes: 'I was of a low and inconsiderable generation, my father's house being of that rank that is meanest and most despised of all families in the land. . . . I never went to school, to Aristotle or Plato, but was brought up in my father's home in a very mean condition, among a company of poor countrymen.' That was the beginning, and here is the ending. Froude writes of Bunyan's works: 'They have for two centuries affected the spiritual opinions of the English race in every part of the world, more powerfully than any book or books except the Bible.'

How shall we explain it? Heredity is something, but how little! Environment is something, but how little! Genius has no ancestry: genius laughs at circumstance. 'The wind bloweth where it listeth.' There are constant irruptions of the Spirit of God into the life of the human race—God finds, or makes new lenses for the light to shine through. He breathes of His spirit into human flesh as He did at the first. And how shall we limit what that breath of the Spirit can accomplish? Why should God not say, 'This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased?' Why should not His eternal light find a lens of the Almighty's making so that the Light of the world is made visible?

The manger is not a sign confined to the first century. But on every occasion when we see the sign we are transported to the first century to a manger where the infant Redeemer was laid. To-day we remember with thankfulness the grace and love of God made manifest in one who was born of a woman and laid in a manger.

3. And the third sign is the sign of the stable. It was not only mean, but as those who have slept in an Eastern stable know, it must have been dirty, unswept, unclean.

We cannot, as the shepherds did, corroborate our faith by seeing the Heavenly Babe in the Bethlehem stable. But here is the thought we have in mind:

Were Christ a thousand times in Bethlehem born
But not in thee—then wert thou still forlorn.

. . . .

Once on a silent night a Child was born
Who brought again what once was lost and torn.

Could but thy soul, O man, become a quiet night
Christ would be born in thee, and set all things right.

We cannot see Jesus the Babe born in a stable—but we can see Him reborn in lives and hearts that are unclean, that have such features in them that we should say they are no places for the dwelling of the Holy Spirit of God. And that sign is not only about us, but it is within us.

There lay in Florence, near the Church of Santa Maria Novella, a huge block of marble. Sculptor after sculptor tried his chisel on it, the idea being to make it into a colossal human figure. All to no purpose except to arouse ridicule. Then came Michelangelo. He built a house over it, and, after eighteen months of secret work, the figure of David was revealed, the majestic figure which to-day is one of the triumphs of Florentine art.

When God tackles the problem of the misshapen soul, it is not by chiselling at it that He brings shapeliness and beauty to it, but by the rebirth of Christ in it.

There is a day in Spring
When under all the earth the secret germs
Begin to stir and glow before they bud.
The wealth and pomp of mid-summer
Lie in the heart of that inglorious hour
Which no man names with blessing, though its work
Is blessed by all the world. Such days there are
In the slow story of the growth of souls.

These are the Nativity days, when Christ is reborn, and the soul which was and is still unclean becomes the shrine where God is.

This is the sign of the stable, and when it appears, though we might not always notice it in others, or even in ourselves, the angels sing Hallelujahs and give glory to God in the Highest.[1]

First Sunday after Christmas.

'I will remember.'

'And I said, This is my infirmity: but I will remember the years of the right hand of the most High.'—Ps 57[10].

In this Psalm a Hebrew poet gives an account of his having gone to God; but not to pray, for he had given up all faith in prayer as useless. He had gone to Him to upbraid Him as an unfeeling Deity. 'Hath the Lord,' he cried, 'forgotten? Hath He shut up His tender mercies? Is His mercy clean gone for ever?' But as he thus complained a thought came into his mind—he does not explain how, perhaps he could not explain how—which changed everything.

That thought is contained in our text. It has two sides to it. Some plants, as we know, have a different colouring on the upper and the lower side of their leaves. The broad-leafed begonia, for example, is on the lower side of its leaf a dull green, while on the upper one it is a rich brown shot through with gold. So is it with this thought. It has two sides. One side, the darker side, relates to the Psalmist himself. 'Then I said, This is *my* infirmity.' He realizes that his trouble is largely due to himself. We do not know what was the cause of the poet's distress originally. Probably it was physical, for he speaks of his 'sore running in the night.' He tells us, too, he could not sleep. 'Thou holdest mine eyes waking.' But if it had begun in a physical malady it had gone far deeper than that. It had been allowed to blot out faith and hope from his soul. It is this he recognizes in the first half of our text. 'Then I said, This is *my* infirmity.'

But this is not the whole, or the chief part, of his spiritual restoration. There is the other side of the leaf—the side which looks upward to the sun. 'But I will remember the years of the right hand of the most High.'

Let us consider the two steps in more detail.

1. There is *the poet's recognition of his own weakness*; and 2. There is *his accompanying vision of God's strength.*

1. It is a hopeful sign of a man, when he turns from self-pity to remonstrance with himself. Pity is at best a poor virtue. It is not to be compared to its twin-sister, Sympathy. When a man regards himself as only an object of commiseration, when he thinks that his faults are only his misfortunes, that every one is to blame for his condition except himself, he is in an evil case. There is no hope for him, indeed, so long as he remains in it. It is therefore always an hour of moral recovery in spiritual experience when this abject commiseration of self is exchanged for accusation, and he can turn to his misfortunes and say like a brave man, 'This is *my* infirmity.'

In *Sartor Resartus*, Carlyle's spiritual autobiography, he tells how he passed through a similar experience. For months he had been suffering from nervous dyspepsia. He could neither sleep nor eat. He was tempted to commit suicide, but his moral upbringing had hitherto kept him back from it. One hot day, in June 18—, he was walking up Leith Walk, in Edinburgh, feeling almost at the end of his resources, when suddenly a thought arrested him, as if a hand had been placed on his shoulder. 'What art thou afraid of?' he said to himself. 'Wherefore like a coward dost thou go whimpering and trembling? What is the worst that can befall thee? Death? Well, then, let it come and I defy it.' As he thus thought, something like a stream of fire seemed to rush through his soul. The temper of his misery was changed, the Devil had said to him: 'The universe is mine and thou art a poor fatherless orphan in it.' But his soul made answer. 'No, I am not thine. I am free. I may die, but I shall not die a coward's death.' 'From that time,' he says, 'I date my spiritual birth. Then first I became a man.' He had passed from the Everlasting No to the Everlasting Yes.

---

[1] E. D. Jarvis, *More than Conquerors*, 53.

Something like that is our author's resolution here, when he says, 'This is thine infirmity.'

2. But there is more in his mind than this. This is only the preliminary to a far grander and nobler resolution than the acknowledgment of his own weakness. There is *an accompanying vision of God's strength and the casting of his soul upon that in faith and hope.* 'Then I said, This is my infirmity; but *I will remember the years of the right hand of the most High.*'[1]

'I will remember.' Nothing is easier than to abuse memory. We abuse it when, for instance, we make it the minister of despair—when our dwelling on the past brings about only a paralysis of all effort and an abandonment of hope; or, when we brood over old injuries and misunderstandings, real and imaginary, until the smouldering ashes of bitterness are fanned into a flame instead of being allowed to die out; or when we make it the minister of discontent. We prostitute the glorious faculty of memory when we employ it only in such a way as renders us miserable and discontented with our present.

Memory is one of the most priceless gifts that God has bestowed upon us. And how should we use it successfully? The first use here is as a means of contrition. Now, if there be nothing in our past that needs forgiveness we are either wondrously advanced in holiness or singularly self-deluded. Two rather celebrated men are said to have declared that, as they looked back upon their early days, they found nothing to regret, nothing to be ashamed of. It may be that they were either very ignorant of themselves or had a very low standard by which they regulated their conduct. But none of us can really doubt the use of memory as a means of self-discipline, and as a healthy sorrow—which includes resolve—for much of our past.

A second use to which memory may well be put is as the spring of hope, and so it is used in this psalm. At first it looked as if the Psalmist were to use it only as an instrument of despair. Nothing could be more despondent than the opening verses of the psalm with its perplexed questionings, Hath God forgotten to be gracious? hath He in anger shut up His tender mercies? But a change comes over the fashion of his dream.[2] 'This is my infirmity—but I will behold, I will think upon, the years of the right hand of the most High.'

The right hand of the most High is a striking and beautiful phrase. It points to power first of all, but not to power only. The right hand is no doubt the symbol of power; with the right hand the worker wields the instrument of labour. But the right hand is not the symbol of power only. It is also the symbol of knowledge and of love. With the right hand the writer wields the pen which is mightier than the sword. With the right hand we grasp the hand of friendship and of help. And so when the Psalmist thinks of 'the right hand of the most High' he thinks of His most original acts of power and wisdom and love.

But the Psalmist does not merely speak of the right hand of the most High, he speaks of 'the years of the right hand of the most High.' And what a panorama that suggests! We seem to see rising before us a mighty range of Alpine peaks, stretching away back into the illimitable distance of time, mountain peaks of human history where God revealed Himself for the defence of His people. These 'years of the right hand of the most High' are long, long years, and if the poet had liked he could have written much about them, as indeed the succeeding Psalmist does; but he concentrates rather upon one, the greatest of them all, when God delivered His people from the mighty power of Egypt. It is a significant circumstance that it is no merely personal or narrow experience that leads the Psalmist to a confident hope but the great, broad, historical fact of Israel's redemption from a cruel bondage. This surely teaches us that, although we seem to have little in our own experience on which to build hope, we have always the great broad fact of redemption as it was carried through in the life and death of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have always the Calvary Cross to look to as the great inspirer of hope.

We are wise, then, if we do some honest thinking and make an effort to lay to heart the lessons of our experience as the Old Year passes from us. The book of memory, if we take the trouble to read it carefully, contains much wisdom and instruction which for the most part have been somewhat painfully acquired. Many of life's opportunities, as we all have good cause to know, never return; but quite a number of them by God's mercy do come back. A good many hopes, ideals, and broken vows have been buried by the wayside. Some of us have suffered, and suffered in soul as well as in body. But those who pledge their loyalty to Him who trod before them the road of life know with confidence and gratitude that, whatever their past may have been, for such as trust His love there is opening up a fresh world.[3]

---

[1] W. M. Mackay, *Our Attitude to Self*, 182.

[2] A. Badenoch, *The Gift of Vision*, 93.

[3] C. L. Warr, *Scottish Sermons and Addresses*, 132.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER CHRISTMAS.

Principles and Perfection.

'Leaving the principles . . . go on unto perfection.'—He 6[1].

The writer of this Epistle to the Hebrews has just been accusing his readers of criminal ignorance of what he calls 'the first principles of the oracles of God.' The time had come when they ought to have been giving themselves to the work of teaching others, yet they themselves still stood much in need of teaching. What they needed was a more intelligent grasp of first principles. The writer proceeds, 'Therefore, leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection.' 'Like a cog-wheel with a catch—our law of life should be one tooth higher in the wheel every day.'

Faithfulness to first principles is an indispensable condition of progress. What our fathers loved were the deep and abiding principles which form the only substantial foundation of good living. The superstructure of an upright moral life received comparatively little attention—beyond the living of it. The ordinary private, family, and social duties were not much in the thoughts of men who were most scrupulous in the performance of them. What they gave themselves to study was not so much the fruit of good works, as the seed of principle, the root of doctrine, from which spring both flower and fruit.

At the same time it cannot be denied that their study of the seed was too microscopical, and their digging among the roots sometimes retarded the harvest. And so a reaction came; and, like most reactions, it carried men to an opposite extreme. 'We have had enough of doctrine,' they cried. 'What we want is something practical.' But already another reaction is setting in. It is not so violent as the first. There need be no fear that it will carry us back to where our forefathers were. What thoughtful men are insisting upon is this, that the one eternal thing in God's universe is truth, that nothing less solid than principle can bear the weight of life. What is being every day more fully realized, by the comparatively few who do their own thinking, is this, that certainty of belief is the sheet-anchor of character, that only after a man has 'taken his stand' can he go forward, that faithfulness to first principles is essential to progress.

On the other hand, it is none the less true that genuine progress involves the leaving of first principles. He who abides by the foundation will never complete his walls. The man who spends his life squaring and plumbing his foundation, or sitting admiring its strength and fair proportions, will never cover himself with a roof. A city of foundation-stones, however well and truly laid, is nothing but a desert after all. He who would reach the copestone must leave the foundation.

This is how Edward Wilson, the great naturalist of the Antarctic Expedition, puts his experience: 'My old beliefs are every atom as strong as ever. It isn't that any of my convictions or any of my longings have altered or died out; it is that they are out of sight only, as the foundations of a house are out of sight, but they are there for as long as the building lasts, and they are quite sound. Once foundations are laid they should be built on, and the more they are built on the more they disappear from view. If ever you see signs of the foundations giving way, then tell me it is time to stop building—but until then and as long as God puts the bricks and mortar before us so constantly, and each day more than we can get finished with, so long must we go on building and building. Every now and then one must glance over the whole show, even look into it carefully, to see that the foundations are not giving way . . . to see that there aren't any cracks or signs of settling.'

In the region of the severely practical also, true progress involves the leaving of first principles. The foundation principle of conduct is duty; but the man who thinks of nothing but duty is morally a babe. As ethical development advances the sense of duty diminishes. The principle is not abandoned, but it is built upon, and so left behind. This truth was apparent even to pagan Pythagoras, who said to his disciples, 'Choose that form of life which is most excellent, and use will render it most delightful.' He whose meat and drink was to do the will of His Father thought nothing of duty. It was a term which, so far as our record informs us, only once fell from His lips. They who had served their Master perfectly were commanded to speak in humble disparagement of their service: 'We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which it was our duty to do.' Let us aspire to this higher level of Christian living, and rise to that which is not so much a principle as a grace, a master-passion. For only he who has left the principles, and become possessed by the passion, can go on to perfection.

Yet in all this there is no minimizing of the importance, the enduring and perpetual value, of first principles. For this advance from first principles strengthens our grasp of them. He knows best what repentance means who has gone from it to 'new obedience'—not the obedience of the slave, but of the son. When I want to learn the nature of faith I go to the man who can tell me something of holiness. He is the most expert sower who has reaped many a harvest. It is the man who has lived the most saintly life, who has walked in closest communion with God, and most in the company of Christ—it is that man who can tell me best what 'the gospel' is. It is not the man who can state principles most glibly, but he who has lived them most consistently, who has the firmest grasp of them. To know my duty I inquire of one who has risen above the thought of duty, I study the life of him who loves. Where is the fullest knowledge of first principles to be found? Among those who, like the Captain of their salvation, have been made perfect through suffering. Who can tell me most impressively the meaning of 'coming to Jesus?' They who see His face, and His name is in their foreheads. He who has made most progress in spiritual experience has the firmest hold on first principles.

Which leads to this final thought, that first principles have infinite issues. Perfection is the only legitimate goal of the Christian life. 'Be ye therefore perfect, as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.' He who is not making for perfection has not yet reached a working knowledge of 'the principles of the doctrine of Christ.' No genuine disciple can be content with spiritual mediocrity. No man can start on the Christian race without becoming increasingly anxious to reach the goal. If you would know whether you have entered the race, ask yourself if there is ever a Divine voice sounding in your soul, urging you forward? If you are conscious of the call you may be assured that the Divine strength will be made perfect in your weakness, and that 'He who hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ':

On, then, to perfection!
  Truth is infinite!
Be not babes, with milk content,
Take the strong meat that is meant
  For the man of might.

Lay no more foundations;
  Seek the higher faith,
And a larger life to know.
For the soul that does not grow
  Is not far from death![1]

---

[1] J. Pollock, *The Farther Horizon*, 218.

First Sunday after Epiphany.

What we all need to Learn—How to Pray.

By the Reverend W. Russell Bowie, D.D., New York.

'And it came to pass, that, as he was praying in a certain place, when he ceased, one of his disciples said unto him, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples.'—Lk 11[1].

The disciples wanted to learn to pray because they had seen Jesus pray. Their own desire did not begin in a vacuum. They wanted to learn what He already knew and to get what they saw He already had.

It is well for us to approach the thought of prayer in that same spirit. If some one should come to us and say, 'Come now and I will teach you about prayer,' the suggestion might leave us cold. But if he should say, 'First, I will show you somebody who prays and show you the difference it makes,' our interest would be alert. So the right Christian message about prayer is never an abstraction. It says to us at the outset, 'Look at Jesus, and see Him pray.' The Gospels are starred with their references to Jesus' prayers. He did not merely teach men about God. They saw in Him a spirit which every day was being lifted up to God. So when we think of prayer, we are not dealing with an exercise handed out to us by some one who has not shared it. We are entering rather into the secret of the greatness of Christ Himself.

1. To whom shall we pray? The New Testament rings with the phrase which is the answer—to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. A man may go a certain distance toward apparent self-fulfilment and self-satisfaction by directing his reverence no higher than his own powers, no higher than the crowd opinion, or no higher than the mass emotion of his own nation. But he will never go all the way toward finding himself and toward finding life until he has stood in the presence of that God whom Jesus called His Father. For Jesus knew that the real God is greater than our own ideas and greater than the ideas of any crowd. The real God is revealed only when a man with a teachable mind and an humble spirit stands still before the utmost that he knows of beauty and goodness and truth. He will feel in contact then with One who is not himself, and yet from whom everything that is best within himself proceeds. The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is the Spirit who gave Jesus the power He had, the One who took a life that was bounded by Nazareth and

Calvary and yet filled it with spiritual energies so tremendous that it shook the earth.

Great forerunners of Jesus had spoken of God in other terms, as 'King,' as 'Judge,' as 'the Almighty Lord.' It is true they had thought of God's fatherhood also. But with Jesus that one thought of God as Father made every other conception disappear, as the rising of the sun makes the stars fade in the sky.

No man can pray to the God to whom Jesus prayed and be proud and self-sufficient. No man can pray to His Father and be subservient to the common impulses of the crowd. No man can pray to that God and then bow down to any narrow nationalism or to any other cruel political or social creed. For the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ humbles the soul before the consciousness of the beauty and the goodness which is infinite, and yet lifts that same soul up by the consciousness that no lesser life than the life it sees in God can satisfy it.

2. How shall we pray? There is a beautiful memory of that grand old saint who walked so close with God, Father Huntington. A boy to whom he was talking one day said that he had no time to pray. As soon as he got up in the morning he had to eat his breakfast and rush off to work. He worked hard all day, and when he got through, he said, he was too tired even to think. 'Where do you live?' asked Father Huntington. The boy told him. It was in a tenement, on the fourth floor. 'Well,' said Father Huntington, 'every morning you come down three flights of stairs. As you come down the first flight, say, "I praise God this day for all His mercies"; and then think of the things you are thankful for. When you come down the second flight, say, "I pray God to keep me this day from harm." When you come down the third flight, say, "I dedicate myself to God this day," and try to think of something you can do for His glory.' How simple that was, and wise, and how astonishingly inclusive!

Consider the three elements in that suggested praying. First, there is praise. Prayer ought to begin that way. We are in danger of shutting ourselves up into our petty little fears and inhibitions if we begin first by *asking* God for something, for the very fact of asking implies that there is something we lack or something we are afraid of, and that shuts us up to a cramped and timid mood. Open first the windows of the soul. Let the mind and heart expand in the recognition of whatever blessings may be already ours. Praise God, if not, as St. Francis did, with ecstasy for all the marvel that he found in God's least and commonest things, yet nevertheless for whatever is good and glad in what we do recognize. Praise Him for all the great framework of life in which our little energies are set. Thank God for every day of health, for the shelter of a house and the blessedness of a home, for food to eat and work to do. Thank Him for friends and books and great interests that widen our minds and put a warmth within our hearts. Thank Him for a child's touch and for the trust in a woman's eyes. Say to ourselves every day: 'Bless the Lord, O my soul; and all that is within me bless His holy name!'

Then we may ask Him to protect us and do it with a braver and more buoyant spirit; for we shall have begun to believe first of all in the essential goodness of life and of the Spirit behind it, and we shall feel that the mighty forces of the universe are on our side.

This does not mean, of course, that we shall always have every particular prayer answered in the way which we at first think is most desirable. Jesus did not. He prayed for His disciples; but He could not keep them all. He prayed in Gethsemane to be delivered from the Cross; but the Cross remained, and the answer to His prayer was strength to go up and be crucified. There is no promise that the soul which prays will have immunity from all the hard things of this earth. There is no promise of an easy road always. The promise is rather of a courage which can walk on any road, be it smooth or be it rough and perilous; and, meanwhile, the man who has learned to pray knows that whatever kind of life he must face, he will find a grace to cope with it courageously and to carry through with a high heart because he knows that God's good purpose for him does not fail. The man who has asked God for protection will know that, whatever may happen externally to his life, there is an inner citadel of confidence which nothing can assail.

As the boy went down the third flight of stairs and went out into the street, he was to say, 'O Lord, I dedicate myself to Thee this day'; and then he was to try to think of something he could do that day to God's glory. Certainly there is nothing in that prayer which the simplest of us can fail to understand, and yet it is so wide that the greatest life could not exhaust it. Many people are busy glorifying themselves, reaching out secret and greedy demands on life, irritated and offended unless the world seems to minister to their importance. Some men glorify a business or profession, and think that they are sufficiently successful if they have exalted the prestige of the organization to which they belong. But the man who has said in his heart, 'I must glorify God this day,' may walk alongside those other men and be engaged in exactly the same activities and yet may touch them with a spirit which makes them altogether different. In his relationship with other people, he is seeking instinctively not what he can get out of them but what he can give them in understanding, in sympathy, and in comradeship. He will put his best strength and diligence into his everyday work; but he will see that work not as an end in itself but as a means through which he can contribute a far-reaching idealism and an unshakable integrity.

3. 'When and where shall we pray?' There are no arbitrary rules. It was Jesus Himself who said that men are not 'heard for their much speaking.' In general, however, it is safe to say that if a man is leading any purposeful life at all he is expending every day more effort and energy than he has the spiritual resources of his own to supply; and he had better every day lift up his heart to God in prayer, and do it regularly. He needs to set his spiritual compass in the morning, and he needs to take his bearings at night and see what sort of a course he has steered that day.

Besides it should be remembered that the prayers which may count for most do not need a long form of words. Prayer is the direction of a sincere desire. It is the quick pull upon the rudder of the purpose that brings the ship of a man's living back into a straight line with the star he steers by. One single sentence in the midst of the rush of the day's affairs may be enough. Let a man say, if need be, no more than this: 'O God, keep me true to the best I was thinking when I did have time to think.'

What of corporate prayer? 'Why not cultivate my spiritual life by myself?' a man might ask. Well, conceivably he might. But it is not likely that in doing so he will get far in the kind of experience that belongs instinctively to a Christian, for the genius of Christianity is a fellowship in spirit. The message of Christianity is that we are sons of one Father, and that the real life is not only a reaching up toward God but a reaching out toward men. We cannot understand the Kingdom of God until we feel it as a comradeship with all the other great souls of the past and present whose purpose and power enter like fire into ours. When the disciples asked Jesus to teach them to pray, it was not that they might go off singly into corners; but that each man for himself, yet all together, they might learn to share His spirit and enter into communion with the God whom they saw reflected in Him.

In the church where one worships habitually, there are innumerable associations which kindle and inspire. Here are the memories of dear and lovely lives. Here breathe the prayers of souls struggling with great temptations, of souls which exemplify the daily heroism of faithfulness in obscure affairs, and of those who out of their own struggles fashion ideals by which a generation may be made better. When one kneels down in the hallowed atmosphere of the church and tries to let his spirit be open to all the influences which are moving there, he may be released from all his inhibitions. The spiritual life may seem to him more wide and sure and real. And even when his own prayers are lame, he will have the sense of those mighty wings of the spirit which in his need will lift him up.

Christianity in Action.

Stewardship of Wealth.

By Sir Daniel M. Hamilton, Balmacara, Ross-shire.

'There Is No Wealth But Life. Life, including all its powers of love, of joy, and of admiration. That country is the richest which nourishes the greatest number of noble and happy human beings; that man is richest who, having perfected the functions of his own life to the utmost, has also the widest helpful influence, both personal, and by means of his possessions, over the lives of others. A strange political economy; the only one, nevertheless, that ever was or can be: all political economy founded on self-interest being but the fulfilment of that which once brought schism into the Policy of angels, and ruin into the Economy of Heaven.'[1]

India with her 360 millions of people, and her many castes and outcasts and creeds, gives more scope for Christianity in action than any other part of the Empire; while the poverty and backwardness of the great masses of the people call urgently for that action to show itself and prove its power and value in the healing of the sick and the feeding of the poor, and in the general uplift of the masses. The urgency of the problem is shown clearly by the depressing facts that only one in ten of the people can read or write, and that India has only one doctor for every fourteen thousand people, compared with one for every 920 in Great Britain; while three-fourths of the people are up to the neck in debt, and bankrupt.

Paul, who saw more deeply under the surface than most men, tells us that the love of money is the root of all evil; and certainly the absence of money among the great agricultural population who make up three-fourths of the people, with its accompanying evil, the money-lender, is one of the root causes of India's being at the bottom of the Empire when her great population entitles her to be nearer the top. The scarcity of money is shown clearly by the fact that while food and other prices tend to find a common level all over the world (due to the development of communications) the wage level in the East is still only eightpence a day compared with eight shillings here. And if further proof of the poverty and bankruptcy of the people is wanted it can be found in the rates of interest payable by the small farmers who form the great bulk of the people. The British farmer can get all the money he wants at five per cent., whilst his little brother living under the same flag in the East, has to pay ten times as much, or go without. According to the recent Report of the Government Banking Inquiry these are the rates payable by the farmers in the 25 districts of Bengal:

DISTRICT.	Money-lenders' usual rates prevalent in the districts. Per cent. per annum.
Burdwan	24 to 175
Birbhum	15 to 37½
Bankura	15 to 25
Midnapur	12 to 75
Hooghly	12 to 37½
Nadia	37½ to 75
Jessore	18¾ to 75
Khulna	25 to 37½
Murshidabad	18 to 120
24-Parganas	15 to 150
Dacca	12 to 192
Mymensingh	24 to 225
Bakarganj	24 to 100
Faridpur	15 to 150
Chittagong	15 to 75
Noakhali	24 to 75
Tippera	24 to 75
Rajshahi	18¾ to 75
Pabna	37½ to 300
Dinajpur	24 to 75
Rangpur	37½ to 66¼
Malda	10¾ to 75
Jalpaiguri	10 to 50
Darjeeling	30 to 60
Howrah	12 to 175

Strangled as she is by the money power, what chance has India to rise in the scale of nations, or to apply her undoubted talents either to her own or to world uplift? None! As Jesus drove the money-changers out of the Temple in Jerusalem so must we drive the money-lender out of the great Indian temple, before it can become the House of Prayer; for it is the money-lender and the love of money, more than anything else, which block the path of India's progress. The way to the heart of the East passes through the Co-operative Bank, the Medical College, and the School. It is the way charted by Jesus when He drove away the money-changer and the money-maker, and drew the multitude after Him by His healing power, plus the loaves and fishes.

The East is calling, and what is the call? In his latest book *Brotherhood Economics*, Kagawa, the Japanese reformer, calls aloud saying, 'Christianity as it is is not Christianity as it should be.' At the Edinburgh Conference on Faith and Order Professor Lew, the Chinese delegate, asked the Conference what it was going to do for his country, which called for something more than theological dry bones. And, speaking for India, Gandhi's call is not unlike that of Kagawa and Lew when he says, 'the Christian should resemble the rose, which sheds its fragrance round and says nothing.' The unchanging East is changing fast, and perhaps the time is at hand when the first shall be last and the last first, and when the East shall reinterpret to the West the religion of Jesus, by showing Christianity in Action 'as it should be.'

To come down from the abstract to the concrete perhaps a short account of the working of the writer's property in Bengal may be of interest. The property consists of rather more than 20,000 acres, of which about 17,000 acres are under cultivation. In its original condition the land was covered with jungle—the home of the tiger and crocodile, the wild pig, and the deer, of which there are still plenty in the neighbouring jungle. It is situated in the delta of the Ganges, about fifty miles south-east of Calcutta. The soil is fertile and grows excellent rice crops, but before it will grow crops of any kind it has to be embanked to keep out the high salt tides which overflow it in its natural state. Having been embanked, and the jungle cut down and burnt, the land is then let out in five or six acre lots to the Indian small farmer known as the *raiyat*, the total population now being about 12,000, of whom three-fourths are Hindu, and the remainder Muhammadan and Christian. It was about thirty years ago that the first few families appeared and began the cultivation of rice; but it was not long before the money-lender also appeared among them, as Satan appeared when Adam and Eve began to cultivate fruit in the Garden of Eden. I was resting in my bungalow one day when one of the first settlers came to see me, and threw himself down at my feet begging me to save him from the *mahajan*—the money-lender. He had borrowed three hundred rupees (£22) from the *mahajan* a few years before, and the loan had grown to seven hundred (£50). The rate of interest was six annas in the rupee (37½ per cent.), but as he had not been able to pay the interest in full the amount unpaid had been added to the principal, and he was bankrupt. Money, instead of being the servant of man had become his master, and he was the captive of the *mahajan*—his slave for life unless freed.

---

[1] Ruskin, *Unto This Last.*

Christianity in action is 'to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound.' I therefore bought the *mahajan's* bond for five hundred rupees (£37 10s.), and gave the debtor a few years to pay up. He was a man of good heart; and, being set free, his Hindu form of Christianity in action showed itself by opening a school for village children, and excavating a water tank which supplied drinking water for his neighbours as well as himself.

This man, multiplied by 300 millions, is India in the year of our Lord, 1937; but, until the silver chains which bind the millions to the money-lender are broken, the millions can do nothing for their own or world uplift, or help in ushering in the Kingdom of God. In the darkness due to debt

> Full many a gem, of purest ray serene,
> The dark unfathomed caves of ocean bear;
> Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,
> And waste its sweetness on the desert air.

In the dark unfathomed caves, and amid the wasted sweetness of the East there lies unlimited scope for Christianity in action, gathering the gems and the flowers. The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few; for Christianity is wavering in action; the home base is weak, and the young men not up to standard.[1]

There were four money-lenders who had dug themselves in on the estate, and were fast bringing all the people into subjection; so one day I called a meeting in the rice fields, and, standing between the *mahajans* and the people, I got to know of every man's loan and bought all the bonds, allowing 15 per cent. interest on the original advance. Whatever I offered the *mahajan* accepted, knowing that there were plenty of fresh outlets elsewhere for the cash down I gave him. The money advanced I recovered gradually from the people.

Having been rescued from the soul-destroying bondage of the money-lender, the people were set on their feet and kept standing upright by the introduction among them of the Co-operative Credit movement which came into India during the Viceroyalty of Lord Curzon. Under this system the people of each village were grouped into a co-operative credit society, every member being responsible for his neighbour's loans as well as his own. The village societies were then formed into a central bank which finances the village societies at 6¼ per cent., and the village society re-lends the money to the individual members at 12½ per cent.—the profit forming a reserve fund for the benefit of the village. The village societies are managed by the *panchayet*, a committee of five members, who know the people and how much money each member requires and can be trusted to make good and return. The loans are recovered after harvest, when the crops are sold. The Co-operative movement has a spiritual as well as a financial and business side, for it unifies the people of all castes and creeds, develops character, and encourages honesty and thrift.

The next stage in the uplift of the people was to build a rice mill of their own for the husking of the paddy or raw rice, thus eliminating the middleman who took a goodly share of any profit going. The estate advanced the money for the building of the mill; most of it has been repaid, and the profit is available for village uplift.

---

[1] The writer understands that, of the three hundred students in the Divinity Halls of the Church of Scotland, only five or six are offering for foreign service.

[These figures are startling, and give food for thought, but perhaps it might be pointed out the total includes students of a three years' course, whereas offers would come normally only from the final year.—Ed.]

The next uplifting move was made two years ago when a One Rupee local currency note was introduced which may fairly be described as a bit of Christianity in action, being an honest note based not on dead metal but on honest work and useful service; and it is working well. The silver rupee is the currency of the country, but a good paper rupee, doing the same work, costs one hundred per cent. less, and will effect a great saving to India when it replaces the silver rupee, as it will do when Government follows the Gosaba[1] example. The note is used in financing the village co-operative societies and in the making of embankments, and in paying the salaries of doctors and teachers and the staff generally. This costless form of credit manufactured direct from, and based on, the labour of the people can also be used to finance co-operatively organized industry and to provide all the money required by Government, thus obviating the necessity of borrowing, and of levying taxation which breeds unrest. It finds work for the workless and makes for peace and goodwill. Here is a copy of the note, which explains itself:

Rs. 1 Sir Daniel Mackinnon Hamilton Rs. 1
promises to pay the Bearer, on demand, at the Co-operative Bhundar, in exchange for value received, One Rupee's Worth of rice, cloth, oil or other goods.

No...................

Gosaba..............................

S. B. Mozumdar, *Manager*. D. M. Hamilton, *Zemindar*.

ONE RUPEE. ONE RUPEE.

The value received in exchange for this Note may be given in the form of bunds constructed, or tanks excavated, or land reclaimed or buildings erected; or in medical or educational service. The Note may be exchanged for coin, if necessary, at the Estate Office. The Note is made good, not by the coin, which makes nothing, but by the assets created and the service rendered. The Note is based on the living man, not on the dead coin. It costs practically nothing, and yields a dividend of One Hundred Per Cent. in land reclaimed, tanks excavated, houses built, etc., and in a more healthy and abundant LIFE.

The West also wants a currency note based on the productive labour of men's hearts, heads, and hands, rather than a mere scrap of paper which contains nothing more than a banker's false promise to pay £1 on demand—which he never does, and cannot do.

The shortage of money in India is also to blame for the illiteracy of the people. And what kind of education can be expected when the pay of the primary school teacher in Bengal (according to the official Hartog report) is only twelve shillings and sixpence per month. The children who do attend these schools for a year or two soon forget all they ever learned; but, until more money is found and better teachers are available, ignorance with its accompanying evils will prevail, and India will remain what she is—a land of waste and want for the many.

It is the same in the medical field. The shortage of doctors and medicine is due to the shortage of money, as is clearly seen from the Report of the Medical Research Council, quoted by the Royal Agricultural Commission of which the present Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow, was chairman:

> 'This All-India Conference of Medical Research Workers believes that the average number of deaths resulting every year from preventable disease is about five or six millions, and that the percentage of infants born in India who reach a wage earning age is about fifty, whereas it is quite possible to raise this percentage to eighty or ninety. This conference believes that these estimates are understatements rather than exaggerations, but allowing for the greatest possible margin of error, it is absolutely certain that the wastage of life and efficiency which results from preventable disease costs India several hundreds of crores (several hundreds of millions sterling) each year. This conference believes that it is possible to prevent a great proportion of this waste at a cost which is small in comparison with the expenditure. This conference believes that the greatest cause of poverty and financial stringency in India is loss of efficiency resulting from preventable disease: and, therefore, considers that lack of funds, far from being a reason for postponing the enquiry, is a strong reason for immediate investigation of the question.'

Five or six millions of lives and many millions sterling sacrificed every year to the goddess of Financial Stringency is a big price to pay for stagnation; and it is the business of Christianity in action to save the lives, and to help in finding the money without which India cannot rise spiritually, economically, or politically, or apply her ten talents to her own or to world uplift.

---

[1] The writer's property in Bengal.

Kagawa says rightly that the gospel should be linked to every branch of life; for if God is to be All in All He must be in finance and economics and politics; and it is because He is not given His due place in all these fields that the world is in so sorry a mess to-day. On the other hand, the London *Times*, which represents the more conservative side of life, thinks that Christianity should remain out of action in all but the spiritual field. In a leading article on the Oxford Conference, in its issue of 2nd August, it writes:

> 'From the outset the Conference suffered from attempting an impossibly wide programme. In something less than a fortnight about 800 members, speaking a variety of tongues, set themselves not merely to discuss, but to reach, united conclusions about social and national life, the economic order, international affairs, the Christian ethic in regard to war, and education. To a considerable extent a World Conference of Christians might have been better employed in pondering specifically religious subjects, instead of devoting much of its time to political and economic issues. One of the principal tasks, for instance, undertaken by the Conference was to draft and adopt a report on the economic order of society. It was noticed that this report "discusses only the shortcomings of the so-called capitalist countries of the world" and that while it condemns, in language of the type with which we are familiar in this country, the shortcomings of the existing economic system, it has no alternative scheme to offer.'

The Press is perhaps the most powerful pulpit of the day, but its teaching, like that of the clergy, is not always that of the Sermon on the Mount. Christianity in action ought to have its great penny Daily to put the non-christian press out of action. Shares of a few shillings per head of its members and adherents might suffice to buy up the best of the Dailies, which might then preach Christianity in action in all branches of national and international life. The Dean of St. Paul's statement that the direct application of the principles of the Sermon on the Mount to the world of to-day would mean 'the sudden death of civilized society' should not go unchallenged. Is it not rather that civilized society is dying to-day because the principles of the Sermon on the Mount are not applied? Mr. Gandhi is a firm believer in the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount, and would like to have an economic system based thereon. Mr. Gandhi is ready to take the plunge: is the Dean going to stand trembling on the brink? The challenge of *The Times* that the Oxford Conference should offer an alternative to the existing economic order should be accepted. For, a social order which divides man from man, and under which 'some drink life's rue and some its wine' and leaves the balance unadjusted, is far from perfect; and gives plenty of scope for Christianity in action. The Dean evidently fears that if the existing system goes civilization will go with it; but progress implies change. 'That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die,' and what if a more abundant life should spring from the dying seed?

In this time of violence, and in the passing of the glittering gold standard of the West, and the coming of the man standard of the East as set by the Sermon on the Mount, do we not see the exposition of the eighteenth chapter of the Book of Revelation which foretells the downfall of modern Babylon and the existing mercantile system with its traffic in 'souls of men.' And do we not hear 'another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.'

The fatal flaw in the existing economic system is that it inclines men to worship Mammon the goddess of riches, rather than God the Creator of all good life. Writing seventy-five years ago, when money had not the power which it has to-day over the souls and bodies of men, Ruskin said:

> 'The attraction of riches is already too strong, as their authority is already too weighty, for the reason of mankind. I said in my last paper that nothing in history had ever been so disgraceful to human intellect as the acceptance among us of the common doctrines of political economy as a science. I have many grounds for saying this, but one of the chief may be given in a few words. I know no previous instance in history of a nation's establishing a systematic disobedience to the first principles of its professed religion. The writings which we (verbally) esteem as divine, not only denounce the love of money as the source of all evil, and as an idolatry abhorred of the Deity, but declare mammon service to be the accurate and irreconcilable opposite of God's service; and, whenever they speak of riches absolute, and poverty absolute, declare woe to the rich, and blessing to the poor. Where-

upon we forthwith investigate a science of becoming rich, as the shortest road to national prosperity.'

In acquiescing in, and living by, the existing economic system, the Church acquiesces in the worship of Mammon, which is the absolute and irreconcilable opposite of the worship of God. The system must, therefore, be recast into the shape divine, and the recasting should be done by Christianity in action.

When Ruskin wrote in capital letters 'There is no wealth but life' he uttered the greatest of economic truths; for money has no value unless it can be converted into food, and food has no value until eaten and converted into flesh and blood or life. Adam Smith taught the same truth in the first words of *The Wealth of Nations* when he wrote 'The annual labour of every nation is the fund which supplies it with all the necessaries and conveniences of life.' Labour is life in action, and upon the quality of the life depends the quality of the man and the nation and the world. And as 'an honest man's the noblest work of God,' so also is he the most valuable coin of the realm, and the only sound base of bank credit which is only paperized honesty or faith. The bank provides the paper, the man provides the honesty and the labour which make the paper good by turning it into the necessaries and conveniences of life. And it is the business of Christianity in action to mint these valuable coins, and to destroy whatever interferes with the minting.

The existing competitive order, with its dividends in money rather than in life, must give place to something better 'that to perfection's sacred height we nearer still may rise.' And that something will be neither Communism nor Socialism nor Fascism nor Nazism, but a co-operative order of society whose guiding principle will be a more abundant life for the many, rather than more abundant money for the few, and in which the many will be ONE. 'I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me.'

Contributions and Comments.

East, North, South, West.

'On the east were three gates; and on the north three gates; and on the south three gates; and on the west three gates.' So does the Seer in Rev 21[13] distribute the twelve gates among the four sides of the Holy City. Why the order E N S W? Is it deliberate? Every commentator points out that in Ezk 48[31-34] where the prophet apportions the gates among the sides of his city the order is N E S W, and that in Nu 2 where instructions are given as to the way in which the tribes are to encamp the order is E S W N. Some of the commentators add that in chs. 34–36 of 1 Enoch we have the order N W S E. In these three passages the four sides of the square follow a regular, orderly sequence. In Rev 21[13], on the other hand, the four sides do not follow each other in regular order: the arrangement is irregular and unexpected. Is there any explanation?

Swete after giving the order in Nu 2 and in Ezk 48 observes that John's order 'not only differs from both, but suggests that the Seer after surveying the east and north walls returns to his starting place in order to examine those on the south and west.' 'It is difficult,' he adds, 'to understand the purpose of this change, yet it seems to be deliberate.'

Archdeacon Charles in the course of a long note on 21[19, 20], which he seems to me to make unnecessarily complicated by the introduction of much that has no bearing on the conclusion ultimately reached, says: 'We are tempted to ask why does the angel adopt an apparently capricious order and measure the sides of the Holy City E. N. S. W.? I know of no certain explanation.'

In Lohmeyer's note on 21[13] we read: 'Die merkwürdige Folge in 13 von Osten, Süden, Norden, Westen ist nicht sicher zu erklären.' Notice the order. It is the only one mentioned in the note. He has the usual order in his text, but makes no reference to it in his note. The order E S N W is found in one cursive only, written in the sixteenth century. Lohmeyer suggests that the plan of Babylon may explain this order in the cursive. But it seems a very long way to go for an explanation. Why should John in his description of the New Jerusalem be influenced by the geography of Babylon of all places?

Now all that I am concerned to point out in this note is that in Ezk 42^{16-19} we have the very order of Rev 21^{13}. In this passage in Ezekiel when the angel has measured the inner house of the Temple he proceeds to measure the whole enclosure. First he measures the east side, then the north side, then the south side, then the west side. Here surely we are to find the explanation of the order in Rev 21^{13}. No commentary that I have been able to consult (either on Ezekiel or on the Apocalypse) makes any mention of the correspondence between the order in Ezk 42^{16-19} and that of Rev 21^{13}.

It is an interesting fact that in Ezk 42^{16-19} the LXX departs from the order of the Hebrew, having the four sides in the regular sequence ENWS. This is obviously an attempt to improve upon the order of the Hebrew.

Why Ezekiel adopts this strange order in 42^{16-19} when he has the sides of the city in proper sequence in 48^{31-34} I cannot imagine. Inasmuch as the angel emerges by the eastern gate he naturally measures the east side first. But why does he not go round the remaining sides in order? And why does John select the order of Ezk 42 and not that of Ezk 48? His choice is particularly strange inasmuch as in 21^{13} he is giving the positions of the gates—the very thing Ezekiel is doing in ch. 48. It would appear that while he was reproducing the arrangement of the gates from Ezk 48^{31-34} his mind was influenced by a recollection of the order of the measuring of the sides of the Temple in 42^{16-19}.

J. Hugh Michael.

Emmanuel College, Toronto.

The Parable of the Pearl Merchant: Matthew xiii. 45, 46.

This parable is generally paired with that of the Hidden Treasure, in disregard of the fact that if they were a true pair we should expect, 'The Kingdom of heaven is like unto a pearl of great price,' where we have '. . . is like unto a man that is a merchant.'

The usual interpretation implies (1) that our Lord was speaking inaccurately, or (2) that He was incorrectly reported. (2) is the more likely; but an alternative is to couple the parable with the one that follows—the Drag-net. In the latter, the Kingdom gathers both good and bad, and the bad is cast away. In the former, 'goodly pearls' are sought (and found), but they are sacrificed for the sake of the 'pearl of great price.' This suggests that in the Kingdom the good is not allowed to become the enemy of the best. 'Time makes ancient good uncouth.' But 'the best,' for the purpose of this parable, is not the Kingdom; it is the ultimate good which the Kingdom discovers in its eager quest.

Thus interpreted the parable links together the present and future aspects of the Kingdom, gives it a progressive content, and shows it to be active, questing, adventurous in spirit. The succeeding parable illustrates the risk which always attends such a spirit—bad as well as good may be gathered—and indicates the swift discernment with which the bad is to be cast away (vv.$^{49-50}$ are almost certainly a gloss; in the parable itself there is no delay).

'The kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a merchant *seeking* . . .' If T. W. Manson (*The Teaching of Jesus*, ch. 7) is right in equating the Kingdom of God with the Son of Man, the parable becomes the more significant. In any case, it seems a possible and suggestive interpretation, and avoids the necessity of doing violence to the form in which the parable is recorded.

Herbert S. Hayman.

Hertford.

'Until Shiloh come' (Genesis xlix. 10).

Apart from the central difficulty about the word 'Shiloh' there are two puzzling features in this prophecy: (1) It seems to imply that Judah took the lead from the beginning; (2) that this pre-eminence will cease when the Messiah comes.

Is not the first step towards a solution of the difficulty a simple departure from the traditional punctuation? thus:

The Sceptre shall not depart from Judah:
And the Lawgiver between his feet *is* for ever;
For Shiloh shall come:
And to him shall the obedience of the peoples be.

'For ever' thus gives a natural parallel with 'shall not depart.' Shiloh may then be interpreted (first) in its natural sense as the *place*, used as a symbol of the sanctuary of the ark. Since this has come to Judah, and the Shekinah has said, 'This is my rest for ever: Here will I dwell for I have a delight therein,' the tribes will naturally go up thither and to him shall the obedience of the peoples be.

One naturally recalls the אבי עד of Is 9^5, and even the LXX reading, 'I will bring.' Possibly Jeremiah also had the prophecy in mind when he bade the men of Jerusalem, 'Go now unto my place which was in Shiloh.'

'For Shiloh shall go' (like the sun setting) is just possible and gives simple sense corresponding with 'not depart.' The jingling rhyme *yabho'*, *Shiloh*, followed by *ve lo* taking up the first *Lo*, rather helps the effect. W. A. Wordsworth.

Hindhead, Surrey.

Entre Nous.

Henry T. Hodgkin.

The biography of Henry T. Hodgkin has been written, and written finely, by Dr. H. G. Wood (S.C.M.; 5s. net). Not the lack but rather the wealth of material at his disposal has been Dr. Wood's difficulty. But crowded though it was with work, Henry Hodgkin's history was the least of him. It is the man himself—his spiritual life—that makes the deep impression.

But to get the background right let us recapitulate briefly the outstanding events in his crowded life.

Henry T. Hodgkin was born in Darlington. He came of Quaker stock on both sides, for his mother was a Pease and his father was descended from two notable families—the Backhouses and the Hodgkins. Henry was the second child of Jonathan Backhouse Hodgkin and his wife, Mary Anna Pease. Even as a little boy he was trained to endure discomfort, and his old governess tells some revealing stories such as that the little boy had to sit always with his back to the horses. She was never allowed to give him her place. 'He was told that he must conquer the fear of sickness, for as a man he would often have to take a back seat.' As early as his second year at Leighton Park School we find him writing, 'My main wish for life, as it always has been and still is, is to devote the best of my life to service of Him to whom I owe everything.' His mind had already turned to medicine as he believed that on the mission field that would be the training that would be most useful. At Cambridge he took an active part in the Student Movement. In May 1904 he and his newly married wife offered for work in China with the 'Friends' Foreign Missionary Association.' He had to furnish persons willing to testify to his fitness. One of these was Rendel Harris who answered the questions put to him in his own delightful fashion. In reply to 'What is your opinion of his Christian character?' Dr. Rendel Harris said, 'He is a precious plant of the Heavenly Kingdom'; and to another question he replied, 'I think he is thoroughly devoted to Christ, alive to the exigencies of the time, and willing either for work or sacrifice.' And at the end of all the replies he put a postscript. 'I love him much.'

In the beginning of 1905 Henry Hodgkin began his first term of work in China, and we find him early stressing the need to make the Chinese feel that the work is theirs. The right method of approach he describes tentatively:

'By asking students and educated men to my own house and exchanging visits with them, I would hope to become so intimately acquainted with them that we could thoroughly discuss together the deepest problems of life, and so to gather around myself a group of men who would be in the truest sense my personal friends, and whose life would be influenced by contact with our home life. It seems to me that the crown of one's work would be in just this particular thing, and that methods of work must be judged entirely by their success or failure in bringing me into this close personal relationship with Chinese students.'

In 1910 he came back to London to act as Secretary to the 'Friends' Foreign Missionary Association,' and this took most of his energies for the next ten years. These years were spent not only, however, in organizing work but in travel, so that he might acquaint himself with the different mission fields. Then there followed the War years and the founding of the Fellowship of Reconciliation. Henry Hodgkin was a pacifist, but not perhaps as thoroughgoing as some of the other members of the F.O.R., and he held himself aloof from the 'stop the War' campaign. He urged that even if war was more honourable than neutrality for Great Britain in 1914, this presumed better alternative was so wrong in itself that the search for a more Christian way was laid upon us as a people.

In the spring of 1920 Henry Hodgkin gave up his administrative work and he and his wife laid before the yearly meeting their concern to pay an extended visit to China to commend to the Chinese people the interpretation of the Christian gospel which had been tried in the furnace of war. Five years followed as secretary of the newly formed National Christian Council of China—and then a too brief period as Principal of Pendle Hill—a training college of the Friends in the U.S.A. He died in March 1933.

Henry Hodgkin impressed every one. In every way he was big—his physical appearance commanding, mind brilliant, his outlook wide and generous. There was a steadfast assurance about his spiritual life. After his death his secretary said, 'The thought of him gives us all confidence.'

Advent.

In *The Strength of My Life* (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net), Miss B. D. Muir has prepared a helpful little guide to prayer for older children. Miss Muir knows their difficulties in concentrating, and so opposite each prayer are 'Thoughts for our own minds before we speak to God.'

The thoughts for the Advent Prayer are:

'Advent means "coming." The four weeks before Christmas are a good time to prepare ourselves to take a part in the festival, at which we remember the first coming of the Lord Jesus, that little Baby laid in a manger for a cot, because there was no room for Him in the inn.

'Let us prepare a place for Him in our hearts and lives. We must not shut Him out.'

Of the prayers, the Bishop of Bristol says in his Introduction, 'They are prayers which the children can really pray, not merely say.' Here is the one for Advent:

> 'O Lord, we would have Thee in our hearts and homes and about our pathway all through our lives.
>
> 'Grant we may not drive Thee from us by our coldness of heart or lack of love for Thy other children.
>
> 'Help us to prepare ourselves daily to welcome Thee anew this Christmas, and grant that throughout our lives we may live so close to Thee that at the Last Great Day we may see Thee as Thou art. AMEN.'

Christian Courtesy.

Mr. E. B. Waggett, in the *Church Times* for November 12th, says of Dick Sheppard, that as a boy of twelve he was already a young saint: 'Lawrie, as we then called him, was not merely "unspotted from the world," but had in complete degree the positive quality of Christian courtesy. It was natural to the boy on every occasion to think "of the other fellow first." That in later life he developed dynamic powers in an extraordinary degree is common knowledge; where his judgment is in question only the history of future years can decide.'

A Religious Evening.

Samuel Pepys, listener (otherwise R. M. Freeman), writes in the *Radio Times* for October 15th: 'This is the 1st Lord's Day for a great while whereon I have skipt both morning church (by attendance) and evening church (by Wireless); having made it my rule to be allways at least a oncer, and, when possible, a twicer. But on this particular day, some twekes of the sciatique did intimidate me from venturing abroad in the morning; while in the evening, just as I was searching the *Radio Times* for the church whose service promist to like me best, who shd call in but Mr. Wix for a pipe and a chatt, and I cd not civilly disappoint him therein. However, being not unmindfull of the Day, I was studious presently to divert our discourse from secular to sacred matters, in particular pulpiteering matters, and the sorry stuff that do often pass for sermouns nowadays, old Blick's and others? Soe we had not a wholly irreligious evening after all.'

The Gates of New Life.

Just as this magazine was going to press we received a volume of sermons by the Reverend James S. Stewart, B.D., of North Morningside Church, Edinburgh. In the meantime let us say that there is a warm evangelic quality in these sermons, and there is evidence of very wide reading. The volume, with the title *The Gates of New Life*, is one of Messrs. T. & T. Clark's 'Scholar as Preacher' Series (7s. net). It will make him more widely known as a preacher: he is already known as a scholar. This is a volume of such sermons as come only infrequently into our hands and we would suggest that it should be on the list of books to be procured this Christmas.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Admirers of Dr. William Adams Brown (and they are many, and in all the churches) will welcome another volume from his busy pen. It bears the title, *The Minister: His World and His Work* (Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tenn.; $2.00), and is described in the sub-title as 'a study of some pressing tasks and problems of present-day Protestantism.' In effect it is a significant and timeous contribution to the literature of Practical Theology.

We commend, especially to ministers of religion, the chapters on the Minister as Priest, the Minister as Evangelist, the Minister as Teacher, the Minister as Pastor, and the Minister as Churchman. In all these chapters the author says informative and useful things out of the fullness of his learning and experience. But we would here direct the attention of our readers in particular to a chapter in the earlier part of the work in which the author seeks to fortify ministers in the face of a certain modern challenge to faith.

The belief in God is nowadays challenged on two main grounds. It is challenged on intellectual grounds by scientists who tell us that the God whom religion offers us is not real. It is challenged even more directly on moral grounds by reformers who assure us that the God whom religion offers us is not good. The scientist's substitute for God is Nature; the reformer's—or moralist's, or humanist's—substitute is Man.

Vol. XLIX.—No. 4.—January 1938.

It is the chapter in which the humanist's substitute for God is discussed which we would now present in outline. The humanist sees in religious belief not the chief motive for service to man, but an obstacle to human progress; and, as a working substitute for the faith he would have us discard, he would ask us to turn to man and in the service of man to find a sufficient object for devotion.

As for the form this devotion to man should take, it should either be individual self-development, self-realization, self-expression, or the endeavour after the good of society. Some humanists emphasize the first alternative, others the second.

But the philosophy of self-expression as a substitute for God carries with it certain difficulties. One is that the attempt of an individual to express himself may bring him into conflict with other individuals similarly seeking self-expression. Another, and even more serious, difficulty is that the desire of each individual is subject to change with advancing years. But the fundamental difficulty is that there is no such thing as an isolated individual. Man realizes himself only through relation to other persons or to that system of collective relationships known by such terms as family, class, or nation.

But in recent years we have been hearing less of the philosophy of self-expression, and more of the second substitute for God presented to us by our contemporary humanists—devotion to the social good. Man as an individual they would replace by mankind as a whole, but not the humanity of to-day with its imperfections, but the perfected humanity of the future—perfected through the new knowledge which science will increasingly bring.

When we ask how this ideal society is to be reached, we find the ways parting. Some humanists advocate the way of reconstruction, others that of revolution. Those who take the first view—Bernard Shaw, for example—are inclined to be conservative in their attitude toward existing social institutions, many even to the social institution of the Church. Those who take the second view—the Communists of contemporary Russia, for example—tolerate no attempt to remodel old institutions like the Church or to redefine old terms like the word God. They would break completely with an error so deep-seated and long-continued as belief in God.

'It is the view taken of the State which differentiates the Communistic philosophy from that of contemporary Nationalism in its Fascist form. Both alike magnify the State as having the right to the loyalty and devotion of all its citizens. But to the Fascist, whether he be Italian or National Socialist, loyalty to the State is justified as inherently excellent, the normal expression of man's highest aspiration; whereas to the Communist this devotion is regarded as a temporary expedient, necessary to be sure, because of the fact of the class war, but at its best only a stage through which the Communist movement must pass on to its ultimate goal, the universal rule of the proletariat in a world from which all classes have disappeared.'

What should be the Christian attitude towards humanism? With what spirit should the Christian meet its challenge? He should sympathize with the movement in so far as it is a protest against evils for which he himself is partly to blame. He should also recognize that it stands for three great convictions, which Christians can share: the value of man as man, a truth which Jesus Christ Himself affirmed; the competency of man, his ability to become what he ought to be—but in dependence, says the theist, not upon Nature but upon God; the responsibility of man for making use of his power to change the world for the better. Pride and selfishness alone cannot explain the rise and extraordinary vitality of these new religions—Communism, Fascism, National Socialism. Something larger and nobler is involved, something that appeals to loyalty and justifies sacrifice.

But while within the individual nation the sovereignty of the State is the condition of all ordered and stable life, in the world of nations the assertion of unrestricted national sovereignty threatens mankind with anarchy. This is the situation which we face to-day. And Dr. Adams Brown concludes that against such a misguided loyalty the one defence is a higher loyalty—loyalty to the God who has made of one blood all the members of the human race, and that the one institution which exists to remind men of this fact and to summon them to this highest allegiance is the Christian Church.

Friedrich Heiler's *Das Gebet*, published a few months before the end of the World War, has become a standard book on prayer. It was translated (with the omission of certain sections, and of much of the illustrative material) into English in 1932 by Samuel M'Comb with the assistance of J. Edgar Park—*Prayer: A Study in the History and Psychology of Religion*—and published by the Oxford University Press. And now it has been reissued in the series, 'The Oxford Bookshelf,' at the very moderate price of 6s. net.

It will serve to call attention to this reissue of so important and useful a book if we analyse for our readers one of its discussions. Let us take the discussion in the last chapter on 'The Essence of Prayer.'

Heiler begins by reminding us of the astonishing multiplicity of forms in which prayer appears in history. He gives what seems to be a fairly exhaustive list of them, and then proceeds to ask:

What is common to all these diverse kinds of prayer, what underlies all these phenomenal forms, in a word, what is the essence of prayer?

If we would understand the essence of prayer we must separate the primary from the secondary types and concentrate upon the former. The primary types are the naïve prayer of primitive man, the devotional life of men of religious genius, the prayers of great men, the common prayer of public worship in so far as it has not hardened into stiff, conventional forms. In all these instances prayer appears to be an immediate expression, bursting forth with native energy, of an original and profound experience of the soul.

Fixing our attention, then, on prayer in its primary simplicity, we must first of all discover the essential motive of prayer, its common psychological root. What moves men to pray? It is the effort to fortify, to enhance life. 'The hungry pygmy who begs for food, the entranced mystic, absorbed in the greatness and beauty of the infinite God, the guilt-oppressed Christian who prays for forgiveness of sins and assurance of salvation—all are seeking life; they seek a confirmation and an enrichment of their realization of life. Even the Buddhist beggar-monk, who by meditation works himself up into a state of perfect indifference, seeks in the denial of life to attain a higher and purer life.'

But the peculiar essence of prayer is still to be discovered. There are three elements which form the inner structure of the prayer-experience: (1) faith in a living personal God, (2) faith in His real, immediate presence, and (3) a realistic fellowship into which man enters with a God conceived as present.

The first two elements, belief in God's personality and the assurance of His presence, are the two presuppositions of prayer. But prayer itself is no mere belief in the reality of a personal God—such a belief underlies even a theistic metaphysic; nor is it a mere experience of His presence—for this is the accompaniment of the entire life and thought of the great men of religion. Prayer is rather a living relation of man to God, a direct and inner contact, a spiritual commerce, a communion, a union of an 'I' and a 'Thou.'

As anthropomorphism is only a crude form of belief in the personality of God, so belief in the real influence of prayer on the divine will is only a crude form of vital intercourse with God. It does not belong to the essence of prayer. The miracle of prayer does not lie in the influence of man upon God, but in the mysterious contact between man and God established by prayer.

The living communion of the religious man with God in which the essence of prayer consists—with God conceived as personal and present in experience, is only imperfectly realized in the subordinate types of prayer: in liturgical prayer, in the philosophical ideal of prayer, and in certain forms of mystical communion. To pray means to speak to, and have intercourse with God, as suppliant with judge, servant with master, child with father, bride with bridegroom. But the tendency in the subordinate types of prayer is to substitute adoration and devotion for genuine prayer.

'As the mysterious linking of man with the Eternal, prayer is an incomprehensible wonder, a miracle of miracles which is daily brought to pass in the devout soul. The historian and psychologist of religion can only be a spectator and interpreter of that deep and powerful life which is unveiled in prayer: only the religious man can penetrate the mystery.'

In his brilliant *Life of Jesus*, reviewed last month, the Rev. Conrad Noel is urgently concerned with what Jesus meant by the 'Kingdom of God.' He devotes a chapter and a long appendix to the subject. In the former he expounds the ἐντός ὑμῶν of Lk 17[21], and in the latter *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*. Mr. Noel is certain that Jesus was proclaiming the immediate advent of a new world, a commonwealth of justice and love. You do not need, He says to the Pharisees, to strain your eyes, looking for any conventional sign of the Kingdom, for it is here already in My own person and in the little community around Me.

That is the devious meaning of ἐντός ὑμῶν. The Kingdom is in the midst of you. The conventional interpretation, 'within you,' in spite of Canon Streeter, will not do. This is 'the usual theme of the popular preacher,' but the context of the passage in Luke is against it. Most scholars agree in this conclusion. The Greek can bear either meaning, 'within' or 'among,' and in such a case the context must decide. It was the Pharisees who asked the question, *when* the Kingdom would come. Is it conceivable that Jesus would say to *them*, 'the Kingdom of God is within you'? They wanted signs, and Jesus replied that the real signs of the Kingdom were such as they could not understand or value. The signs were already given in His ministry. The Kingdom is not 'here' or 'there.' It is already thundering at your doors.

Those who believe in the Kingdom as within the heart and its coming as a gradual spread from heart to heart are convinced that there will be nothing startling or apocalyptic about it, 'nothing ungentlemanly in its coming.' They are anxious to prove this from the New Testament, partly because they have the timid bourgeois mentality which cannot bear anything so unpleasant or disturbing as a crash, and partly (among other reasons) because they do not feel the horror of the system under which their poorer neighbours groan. They think they do, but there is ample proof that they do not understand in the least. Therefore they say the world is good, doubtless there are serious faults, and the whole apocalyptic assumption they dismiss as Manichean and false to the facts. So Mr. Noel.

And so much for 'within or among.' The Kingdom is not an inner spiritual reality but a new community, already present in Jesus and His disciples. But what of βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ? It is tolerably clear, says Mr. Noel, that the common people generally would have understood the phrase as describing a tangible commonwealth that was coming here on this earth, and that therefore no teacher who used the phrase would have expected the peasants, artisans, craftsmen, to have understood anything different by it. If Jesus had meant something different He would have explained such a departure from the current popular belief.

Further, the current literature which created prevailing conceptions speaks of the expected commonwealth as a kingdom that is coming on this earth. Some of the Psalms of Solomon, for example, ring with this hope of a Utopia of justice and mercy. So the Book of Enoch, and generally almost all contemporary literature. The Kingdom is outward and political, in the true sense of political, public. Mr. Noel's point is apparently that Jesus would naturally use the term in the same sense. But (though we are expounding Mr. Noel not criticising him) a caveat may be briefly stated at this point. It must not be forgotten that it was this very traditional hope of Israel that Jesus rejected in His wilderness temptation. He felt its appeal, but finally broke with it.

But Mr. Noel goes on to grapple with βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. Is it 'reign' or 'commonwealth'? There are those who maintain that it can mean nothing but 'reign.' But Mr. Noel contends that only a study of the leading motifs of the Old Testament can decide. Community is the keynote of the Old Testament. Even the 'I' of the Psalms and Prophets generally refers to the nation. The religion of the Old Testament may be summed up in Jeremiah's phrase, 'they shall be my people, and I will be their God.' If, then, the main theme of the Gospels is God's majesty, sovereignty, or reign, it is odd that the rock from which the New Testament was hewn is this rock of community, and that the very first interpretation of what Jesus meant should again be in terms of community, and not merely of the individual soul. It might, perhaps, be suggested to Mr. Noel that the infinite value of the individual soul was just the supreme truth about man that Jesus asserted.

It seems clear, to continue Mr. Noel's argument, that βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ may mean either reign or commonwealth. Its predominant meaning is sovereignty, according to A. C. Headlam, but he finds in it also the idea of an universal people acknowledging God's rule. And even the late Canon Streeter, who held that ἐντός ὑμῶν can only mean 'within you,' spoke of our Lord's conception as including the idea of a corporate national regeneration of this earth. The conclusion of scholars seems to be that our Lord's use of 'the Kingdom of Heaven,' will include the idea of community, and that such an idea is compatible with the use of the Greek phrase as current in His times.

Mr. Noel goes on to examine the text of the Gospels themselves, and their evidence on the main question. He admits that many of the parables suggest God reigning, though he does not deal with the parables that emphasize most strongly the idea of spiritual inner experience, those of the leaven and mustard seed. But he has no difficulty in finding many passages that cannot very well bear any other meaning than that of a renewed community. And towards the end of his essay Mr. Noel seems to reach a conclusion which common sense will regard as harmonizing both views, outer and inner.

'Even if "within you" be the right rendering,' he says, 'there need be no contradiction, for the ideal of a commonwealth, in which God's own justice and mercy should be made paramount, must first be an idea within the heart—not only in God's heart, but in many hearts inspired by Him—before it becomes actualized and takes shape and dwells among us. Socialism is a collective idea, but it is first the dream of many hearts for which they will give their lives. . . . Home Rule was the dream held sacred within the hearts of many Irish folk. If it had not been within them, it would never have been realized "without" in the outside world of affairs. So that even if "within you" be the correct interpretation, there is here no contradiction.'

And Mr. Noel concludes: 'People may say, what, after all, is the difference? Is this not only another controversy between theorists? What practical effect can it have on life? Reign or commonwealth—what does it matter? Do not many of the advocates hold that if individual after individual accepted God as the ruler of his life, events of a world-shaking nature would be bound to happen? Would not the very face of the world be changed? Is it not, after all, by the conversion of the individual to God that the world will at last be redeemed?' Mr. Noel thinks there is real and vital importance in his insistence on community as prominent in the mind of Jesus. For sheer religious individualism, and the conception of religion as a purely interior affair, carry in them serious dangers. It is urgent for us to realize that Jesus meant to change *this world*, and change it so radically that God's justice would, and will, prevail over the individualism that keeps so many of our neighbours from the life God designed them to have.

The Basis of Worship.

By the Reverend David H. Hislop, D.D., Ardwell, Stranraer.

One characteristic of the age in which we live is a great interest in, if not a heightened sense of, worship. This may arise in part from a leading trait of our era that it is religious though obviously not Christian. For to-day there is the tendency for every one to turn his attitude to life, be it political or scientific, æsthetic or moral, into a religion which dominates his life, thrills his heart, and claims his obedience and allegiance. The atmosphere of this time is one in which men bend their views and thoughts to the demands of a mystical intuition, for not alone in Russia or in Germany does every appeal of politics, art, or science engage those dispositions which are primarily religious in their nature. It is thus not unimportant that men's thoughts should be directed to that act of the soul in which the religious spirit finds expression.

Alongside this temper of to-day there is also found in certain quarters a mood, engendered by the study of comparative religion which evaporates the sense of worship into something else, and by equating the values in all religious experience from the earliest times, reduces worship to the expression of some psychological need in man's nature. Worship can then become nothing more than a contrivance to overcome some inner difficulty which man can outgrow in his development. Worship, individual or collective, appears but as a relic of the past, and the need which once it met is now satisfied by other activities of the mind. But such a purely humanistic standpoint surely puts the cart before the horse. Little or nothing is explained in the worship of developed religion by pointing to its supposed origin. But perchance a light may fall—even on what seems but a groping superstition in the darkness, if the impulse that lay behind is seen in the light of a higher revelation.

Thus at the outset it is imperative to insist that worship, as seen in the light of the Christian revelation, is no ingenious discovery of the human spirit; it is the response of man to the revelation of God. Worship is the answer of man's spirit to the revealed Word; thus worship implies faith, and faith is not the consequence of man's struggle, but the gift of God. The word of the Psalmist gives the profound analysis of worship: 'Seek ye my face; my heart said unto thee, Thy face, Lord, will I seek.' The initiative comes from God. God's hand reaches forth and man's spirit is awakened. This is axiomatic of all worship. God acts: He reveals His glory, His loving-kindness, His grace, His purity, and the purposes of His Kingdom. His spirit touches the soul and the soul expresses its adoration, its thanksgiving, its penitence, its intercession. The basis of worship in its ultimate sense rests on God's revelation. It is surely wiser and more in accord with truth to interpret the impulses of the lower religions in obedience to this postulate of Christian worship than to infringe the inviolate fact that worship is from the hand of God. Christian worship certainly has this definitive basis. God the Father reveals through creation and in redemption the Eternal Word, and the worshipper through Christ and in the Spirit worships. Thus worship can never be a work of merit, for in the deepest sense it is God's Spirit that creates the desire and makes the response to His grace and glory.

This insistence on the primary action of God's Spirit in worship does not involve that the Spirit does not use means. As Berdyaev says in another connexion: 'In the spiritual life there is no distinction and opposition between ends and means.' The fact that the Spirit acts through the constitution of human nature means that a psychological account can be given of this action. Most psychologists deny that there is any special religious instinct at the basis of worship and resolve this instinct into primary emotions. The sense of submission and wonder when united give rise to admiration, and when fear blends with admiration there is awe, and when the feeling of tenderness is linked to awe there is reverence. Otto, as some others, finds the sense of the Holy as primary. But this question need not detain us. At its best such a psychological analysis gives only the ingredients of devotion, the bricks not the design of the architecture, the raw emotion not its significant form and meaning.

However we account for the development of the instinct to worship, it is deeply rooted in man's life, and must be regarded from the standpoint of the Christian faith as a basal fact of human nature. Nor does the experience of the seemingly non-religious, or those who would describe themselves as such, refute this statement. That a man has no appetite for wholesome food is no contradiction of the fact that food is necessary to the human body. It may mean that he is sick. Again, not a few of the extravagant follies of mankind appear to be the misuse of this worshipping attitude, whereby a man devotes himself to what seems greater than himself. And it is most apparent that the attitude of will which is fitting to the Creator is not only unfitting but ethically disastrous when given to any creature. Further, there are sins of flesh as well as of spirit which testify to the clamant need that man must lose, though but for a brief moment, the sense of his restless and unsatisfied self. Nor do the testimonies of noble spirits who have walked the way of the agnostic contradict this statement. Witness is borne to this universal craving by the noble stoicism of such a verse:

Be still, be still my soul; it is but for a season
Let us endure an hour and see injustice done.[1]

Or in such words written by one who professed no belief in God:

I spake to the sea. I desired to have its strength,
its mystery and its glory.[2]

From the viewpoint of Christian worship we must recognize the existence of these emotions of resignation and of adoration which are not conscious of their own witness. The fact that worship is an essential activity of man's spiritual nature, as eating is of his bodily nature, makes wide the horizon of

[1] A. E. Housman.

[2] Richard Jefferies.

Christian worship. For then worship is no cloistered corner of the soul, but is the expression in conscious form of what lies in the heart of mankind. Man, says the Hebrew story, was made in the image of God and what lies in the deeps of this strange nature of ours is the imprisoned spirit. Worship in its widest sense includes the insight and rapture of the poet's dream and the vision and form of the artist's imagination. These things belong to adoration: they are the unconscious witness of God's presence. Worship in its definite sense is the conscious direction of these emotions and capacities to the Eternal God, and Christian worship is this direction to God through Christ in the Spirit.

From this it follows that worship is no accidental thing. It is an essential element in the rhythm of mortal existence. Worship is not the whole of life, for our days are divided into many hours and our existence embraces many interests and emotions. Into each fragment of life the activity of the soul goes: into work, recreation, the life of the body, eating and drinking, exercise, the life of the mind, art, music, literature. Yet each of these however engrossing is but partial, and however insistent its claims, is not universal. There is an attitude of the soul not to a part of life but to the whole, and that attitude is the attitude of worship. For man's attitude to the whole of existence is his attitude to God. This belongs to the ebb and flow of mortal living. For the soul must return from the distraction of its many interests and from the exhaustion of its many tasks to seek renewal at the fountain-head of life and energy. An old Christian hymn makes this invocation: 'O God the persistent energy of things' (*Deus rerum tenax vigor*). As sleep refreshes and as food restores, so worship renews the energy dissipated by living and spent in activity. 'My soul he does restore again' is a plain statement that worship is a necessary part of man's life. In another respect worship belongs to the cycle of living. 'Our little life is rounded with a sleep'; and in the twilight the values of life grow uncertain, and in the shadow its joys seem unreal. To find a meaning in the medley of existence and to know in the soul that life is the good thing which blind instinct in its groping feels, man must see life as a whole; he must be lifted above the hazard and the harass of time's happenings into the peace of the Eternal. The necessity of worship is the need for security in this perilous existence when all we are and all we value seem at times to be at the mercy of death's relentless stroke or life's withering breath. These two needs of man—renewal and security—find their satisfaction in worship, because worship is the attitude of the soul to the whole—to God.

This attitude of worship is communion with a Power that is other than ourselves. Over against man stands the Other. The character of our worship depends on the Being with whom we have communion. In his worship, man's nature needs two things—the Ultimate and the Intimate. The religions of history have not seldom separated these two needs. The Divine Being worshipped has been remote beyond the reach of man's piteous appeal, or so close to man's life that the Divine shared in the vicissitude of time and was partaker of mortal weakness and failure. The Ultimate was inaccessible and the Intimate was so merged in the mortal that the Divine became the ideal reflection of man's own life. But worship calls for the Absolute beyond whom there is none other. Not like the Greek pantheon with Necessity beyond, nor like Setebos with the 'Quiet' overhead. Worship calls also for the Intimate: 'closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet.' Not like the Immanent Will of Hardy's *Dynasts* 'past the sense of kindly-eyed benevolence,' nor like the Deity of Carlyle who does nothing. It is in the Incarnation that this twin demand of worship is met, and through the Christian doctrine of the Trinity—the Eternal Father, God the Creator, the Eternal Son, God the Reconciler, the Eternal Spirit, God the Deliverer who sets free—the Ultimate and the Intimate meet. The God in whom we live and move and have our being, the Word who was made flesh and dwelt among us, the Spirit who maketh intercession.

Thus the faith that is expressed in Christian worship is faith in God—transcendent and immanent. To separate these moments of thought in worship leaves us either with the abyss of the Divine of whom nothing is known for nought is revealed, or with the Divine as the embodiment of human aspiration. It follows then that God's unlikeness to man as well as God's likeness to man come into worship. For man is a creature infinitely removed from the Creator, and the sense of this absolute difference is essential to the worship of the Almighty and All Holy; but man is also a creature made in the image of God, and by his vision of ethical purity and through his human love he finds an interpretation of God's goodness and of God's loving-kindness. This interpretation is made assured in the revelation in Jesus, whose constant name for God was Father, and in the incarnation within our little life of that Spirit who redeems the life of man from sin and self-despising. The soul in worship is ever in a holy place wherein there is no familiarity, for the intimacy of God in redemption is redeeming because it is God the Infinite who redeems. 'Love and Dread,' says Juliana of Norwich, 'are brethren'; and awe and love are blended in worship as man is in the presence of God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible, and of Jesus Christ, who for us men and our salvation was incarnate, lived and suffered and conquered.

Worship has thus these three aspects: the feeling and the awareness of the Divine, the expression and affirmation of faith, the communion with God's Will. It is therefore not one part but the whole of man's nature that is involved in this experience. The emotions of the heart are there, for to worship is something other than to think. Feeling envelops the beliefs of the worshipper, changing them from abstraction into vital things. Feeling also surrounds the submission of the will. Communion with the Divine gives rise to emotions of love and reverence, but these emotions are also the means by which the worshipper knows that he is in the presence of God. The Will is active in worship, for man's will is directed to God as the prelude to worship, and man's will seeks obedience to God's Will as the fruit of worship. Communion with God is the laying of our wills beneath God's Will. The activity of thought is present in intuition and in interpretation. In worship there is the intuitive sense of God's Presence, vague or definite, the sense of a Veiled Presence or a definitely conceived Personality. Also there is the endeavour to interpret this experience of communion and to express this faith. On the level of conscious life, feeling, will, and thought are involved.

But in addition to this, worship is also concerned with what does not fall directly within the focus of consciousness. It is obvious how associations count here. Associations, of which we are not aware, linked to the sound of words or to the sight of objects are frequently most potent factors in our worship. Words like the Lord's Prayer or the Te Deum, objects as the Holy Table, or the Bread and the Wine of the Sacrament, have in them the sense of the numinous. Associations that have little or nothing to do with their meanings are linked to hymns and to texts of Scripture. In yet more subtle ways the subconscious mind plays its part in this experience. In worship the primitive feelings are sublimated, to use the language of psychology, or, to use the language of religion, the Spirit of Christ makes use of these caged instincts and primitive feelings that have been repressed by moral standards, and these are delivered from their bondage and find relief in praise and exultation.

The subconscious enters into all worship, be it private devotion or the public service. Its effect, however, is more potent in public worship, for the presence of other worshippers impinges on our conscious and subconscious mind. 'It does not help me,' wrote Matthew Arnold, 'to think a thing more clearly that thousands of other people are thinking the same, but it does help me to worship with more emotion that thousands of people are worshipping with me.' This characteristic utterance of Arnold is true so far as it goes, though perhaps it does not take us very far. It is a truism to say that men act differently in a crowd from what they would do as individuals. The temper of the crowd is more emotional than that of any individual in it. This is so in the first place, because the individual loses something of his self-consciousness, and this blurs his sense of responsibility; and in the second place, because the individual becomes more suggestible and this makes him more readily adopt a course of action or a way of thought. These qualities in themselves are not good things for they may mean that a crowd is capable of unbridled passion or of fanatical prejudice. But this influence of others upon the individual does provide in public worship an avenue for the action of the Spirit. Contact with others helps to overcome that consciousness of self which is so grievous an obstacle to communion with God, and the influence of others makes more pliant man's mind to the reception of new impulses and fresh aspirations. The worshipper at a public service by reason of the contact of other minds upon his subconscious mind possesses a receptivity that would be hard to obtain otherwise. It may be true that what is new and original is oftenest born in the silent stillness of the solitary place, but it is not always so. Certainly it is through the practice of public worship that a new light can fall upon the familiar, and the ordinary happenings of every day are invested with a glory not of this world. From the constitution of man's mind it would seem then that a greater receptivity and a keener sensitiveness are possible in public worship than in private devotion.

Till now I have spoken of the psychological aspect of worship as an inner experience, but by its very nature the spirit of worship must seek an external expression. It is a condition of man's existence that the inner impulse or mood only becomes our own in the act of expression. As one surveys as things apart the various forms the spirit of worship has taken, they seem dull and dead, like the seaweed left on the beach by the ebbing tide. To worship in spirit and in truth, it has been argued, is to dispense with all the external expression of worship. Certainly the embodiment of the spirit of worship does give it definiteness. But this definiteness is a corollary of revelation. Worship is not an emotional haze before the Infinite : it is the response of a creature to the definite revelation of an Infinite Being—a response of joy and reverence before the glory, of awe before the mystery, of adoring gratitude before the wondrous grace of God's love and redemption. An artist's dream is vague, haunting, and illusive until the dream has found embodiment in colour and line. So the soul of the worshipper demands definite expression for the mood of worship. This applies to private devotion, for if the practice of meditation or the contemplative prayer be more than thinking or reverie, it is because our mood finds expression in the case of meditation in new resolves, fresh lessons, and direct aspirations, and in the case of contemplation, because our mood finds fulfilment in the direct communion of the soul with God.

Yet far more apparent is this need for expression in public worship, for there must be a common utterance of devotion that links through the meaning of word, the significance of action, the associations of sound and of sight, one worshipper with another. Thus worship as an inner experience implies the use in the public service of things belonging to the world of sense in which are incarnate the soaring aspiration and the offering of the soul's devotion. Perchance the worshipper is prone at times to feel in the public service that the adoration far transcends his feelings, that the confession of penitence exaggerates his sense of sinfulness, that the resounding praise is beyond his somewhat limited sense of gratitude. That doubtless is so, for few there be that can claim the soaring vision of the prophet or the adoring joy of the saint, and so many of us come to the service with minds but half withdrawn from 'the busy trade of life.' But let us bear in mind that the public service is not only the expression of our spiritual mood. It certainly ought to be the offering of our high thanksgiving, deepest longing, and our surrendered wills, but it is more. The service ought to be not only the expression of our inner life but the suggestion of the Presence of God and of Christ. Thus language that seems scarce fitting for our little souls is yet the only fitting language in the presence of our Divine Lord and Master. Just as we turn to the great poetry of the world in our mood of love or of sorrow and find an utterance beyond our highest effort, so in the sphere of worship we find the voice of prophetic inspiration and the vision of the saint. This does more than express our mood : it suggests heights we have not trod and deeps we have not fathomed. Not for us—at times we may feel these resplendent robes of the soul, but none the less our souls well know they are the fit 'garments of praise' in the presence of God's glory and exceeding grace. Thus the external means of worship are not only the expression of the soul's offering, they are also the suggestion and the shadow of the Divine Presence.

While it is true that God is always the initiator of worship, for as Jacopone da Todi says : 'Thou art the Love with which the heart loves Thee,' it is also true that God initiates the act of worship in two ways. There are two psychological movements at the basis of worship we may say, if we choose to use such language. It may be that it is but two standpoints, but this gives rise to two figures or shapes in worship. The one may be termed the soul's ascent, the other may be called the spirit's descent. Historically the distinction is seen between the type of religion which emphasizes the aspiration of the soul to God, and this is 'mystical' in character, and the type of religion which dwells on God's approach to man, and this is 'prophetic' in character. Psychologically the difference is between the consciousness of the soul reaching upwards to God and the consciousness of the soul receiving from God. Of course both of these figures within the ambit of the Christian revelation acknowledge that God's hand directs. In the former case, the soul's seeking is in response to God's call ; in the latter, the soul is quiescent before God's revelation. The former brings into special prominence the aspect of God's Being, the mystery of His glory, and the wonder of His Grace ; the latter stresses the power of God, His action in creation and redemption.

There are therefore two figures or shapes in accordance with these two aspects, and both belong to the heritage of the Christian faith. The former has its highest point in adoration where the sense of self is lost in the contemplation of God's glory and grace. It passes through the recognized stages of purgation, illumination, to unity. The soul by confession before God is cleansed by His forgiveness, enlightened by God's truth, and finally is united in adoration, and in the ocean of God's fullness the cramping sense of self vanishes. The second figure of worship has its most profound moment in the awe of the creature before the Creator, the wonder of the redeemed before the Deliverer. In the confession of man's creatureliness the sense of Divine Majesty dominates all, but though the self is as nothing before the face of the Eternal and the littleness of man who is but as a breath is made emphatic, the very fact that the worshipper is so conscious that he is a creature means that his sense of identity does not disappear. This confession of creatureliness leads on to the status given by God's grace to the creature as His child, and in the light of God's revealing truth the soul of the worshipper discovers the purposes of God's Kingdom and learns his duties in the world in which he is set. So the end of this figure of worship is a soul disciplined and equipped for the conflict. What has to be noted is that here the sense of self is not obliterated, it is affirmed. The sense of obeisance before God does not here create as does adoration the sense of unity with God, but rather makes more poignant the difference. These two fundamental patterns of worship need to be related in some order or system.

But not only has worship a figure or shape or pattern, it has also a colour or tone. 'The Eternal light of revelation,' says Karl Adam, 'is differently reflected in the prism of each age with different angles of refraction.' Not only is this so, but the light of revelation is reflected in the pieties of diverse kinds with different angles. The colour or tone of worship varies as the piety is different. This is one of the reasons that the Church has been broken into different communions. What is fundamental in worship is not to be found by ironing out all the differences and finding a lowest common denominator. Nor can we find a common basis of worship if we ignore the tones. For each form of piety expresses the basic or fundamental element in worship through its tone or colour, and so to blot that out leaves nothing worth.

What are these pieties? I am not here dealing with differences of temperament. In the spiritual realm the experience of saints shows how temperament can be transcended. These differences are familiar to any one who has dealt with the prayer life of different souls. There is an *attrait* in each spiritual experience, and the different methods of private devotion as practised (vocal prayer, meditation, affective prayer, contemplation, and mystical prayer) reveal the differences. We can distinguish the following tones: There is objective piety which is sometimes termed ordinary piety, disciplined piety, affective or emotional piety, intellectual piety, and mystical piety. Setting aside theological differences and making a sweeping generalization, I should say that the typical Anglican and Benedictine belongs to the first, the Puritan and the Jesuit to the second, the Wesleyan and the Franciscan to the third, the Presbyterian and Dominican to the fourth, and to the fifth all those souls in all communions at every level of culture and stage of intelligence to whom has been given the mystical nature. They all have their obvious failures when the light of revelation fades and the power of the spirit fails, and may become conventional or cold or florid or arid or vague. But the basis of worship is not something that can be separated from the tones the spirit of worship has painted, and the public worship that is to be the offering and oblation of the Church and the Power and Veil of the Presence must embrace in its white light the tones of each and of all.

Worship as an offering of devotion and thanksgiving and as the surrender of man's will, means that something is done. Worship as the revelation of God's Word and Will means that something is received. Worship as fellowship means that one soul is united with the souls of other worshippers in the spirit of Christ and we are one body because Christ is the spirit of each. Worship is thus a supernatural thing. It is not simply the coming together of decent folks for their edification. It certainly should be for their good. It is not only a witness to our faith. It truly is that, and perhaps it is too little remembered that to meet for worship is to make our witness. Worship is also the offering to the Creator of the praise and thanksgiving of all creation which find in man alone its conscious voice; it is also the offering by the Church of the redeemed, of the praise and gratitude of lives delivered from fear and death's menace. 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I.' The Unseen Presence amid such ordinary people, the Hidden Glory shadowed in a meeting that seems so dull and barren, the Veiled Face only to faith uncovered.

Literature.

MARX, FREUD, AND BUNYAN.

Mr. Huckleberry Finn remarked about the *Pilgrim's Progress* that the statements in it were 'interesting but steep.' Mr. Jack Lindsay in his *John Bunyan, Maker of Myths* (Methuen; 10s. 6d. net), appears to share this profound judgment. Indeed the statements, not only in the *Pilgrim's Progress* but in *Grace Abounding* and the *Holy War*, are so steep that he has enlisted the aid of Marx and Freud to interpret them. It is true that the names of these eminent persons do not occur anywhere in the book, but their shadows are always in the background. Mr. Lindsay is convinced that, 'though formally accepted, Bunyan has never been understood,' and in this fresh biography the writer has set out to repair this omission by considering Bunyan and his statements from a new angle, with a new focus. 'The new focus is provided by the attempt to relate Bunyan's work in particular, and the Protestant movement in general, to the social forces from which they sprang.' At the same time the author has analysed the myth-making faculty in Bunyan, and tried to show how his allegories take their place in the world of symbolism and myth.

Mr. Lindsay has pictured in an arresting fashion the democratic currents of Bunyan's day and their influence on the democratic movement of our own time; and if he had presented Bunyan's life and thought on this background we should have had a significant contribution. But he has gone very much further. The struggles of Bunyan's soul were really sociological conflicts put in an 'ideological' form. It is the mesh of capitalist values in which he is caught. Selling Christ is betraying the poor. 'The poor are Christ.' The belief in 'grace' was an effort to reconcile the sufferer to a world in which capitalist values could not be evaded. The essence of the religious notion of election is to be found in the wish to submit to the blind operation of irresistible class forces. *Grace Abounding* mirrored a *social* crisis. The dropping of Christian's burden is the intuition of the social unity that will some day result from the throwing off of the parasite. The man with the muck-rake represents the blindly accumulating capitalist. Thus every experience of Bunyan's religious life which we have been accustomed to interpret religiously must be seen to be a kind of longing for a classless society.

Freud is not far away either. 'Underneath the direct castration-fear of father-vengeance, the fear of the murder-phallos, there is the revolt against authority. . . .' Blasphemy is the oath-curse taking on a detached life of its own under increasing class-pressure. The 'eternal-inheritance' which Bunyan so desired is the symbol of that security which possession of the land granted. Regeneration is the abstracted form of the initiation rite. And so on.

If this is the proper way to read Bunyan he has certainly never been understood until now. What comes, however, to the reader of this biography is a complete sense of unreality. When Mr. Lindsay is writing historically he interests, and even enlightens, us. His picture of Bunyan's time is clear and impressive. But his main contention, that Bunyan was writing of the social crisis of his day in an ideological form is fantastic. The writer's attitude to religion disables him from understanding evangelical experience. It is important, he says, for the purposes of his book 'to get rid of any idea of "eternal verities" and to show the social relation of all human thinking.' Wesley, he tells us, canalized the revolutionary impulses of the masses in the eighteenth century and sent them to drain away in the arid sands of the religious abstraction. The Almighty is reduced to 'the irresistible force of human history.' It is unlikely that any one with this attitude to religion generally will understand the simple passionate spiritual history of Bunyan. Mr. Lindsay does not understand it. It was perhaps inevitable that psycho-analysis should try its prentice hand on Bunyan. The result is not convincing, even when it is largely inspired and aided by a communistic socialism. No doubt there is a social significance in *Grace Abounding* and the *Pilgrim's Progress*. But they will always remain, what they are, classics of the experience of divine grace. And, even if we do not with Mr. Bernard Shaw consider Bunyan superior to Shakespeare, he will always remain supreme in his own field.

CHRIST OR CHAOS.

By his well-known book, 'The Christ of the Indian Road,' Mr. Stanley Jones has won for himself a large public who will listen to his words with eager attention. This makes his latest book, *Christ and Present World Issues* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net), important. For he has something serious and urgent to say in it. It is a bold and a Christian book. It is bold because what he advocates is nothing short of Christian Communism. The Russian experiment he condemns, but always with a qualifying clause. If only Russia were not anti-religious, if only it would make room for God, it would not be far away from his ideal. Fascism and Naziism he fiercely and wholly repudiates, and Communism so far as it dethrones God and disrupts family life. But his own position is very radical. The book is Christian alike in its spirit, in its loyalty to Christ, and in its passionate plea for justice to the poor and needy.

His message to our generation is the Kingdom of God. It was Christ's supreme aim to preach and to found the Kingdom. And the Kingdom is not merely God's rule in the soul but a reconstruction which would extend through the economic, social, political, physical, spiritual, and the total order, to be accomplished by the redemptive Spirit of God, working directly and through *every* right agency. It is God ruling *all* life. As to particulars, there are two features of the Kingdom which are stressed by the writer. The Spirit of Christ will unify all life. This does not mean merely a good spirit pervading all classes. You cannot have the unity of the Kingdom without economic and social unity. You cannot have real unity 'across the chasms of economic and social differences.' This would seem to imply a 'classless' society. Not, it is true, a society with only the proletarian class, but one without any economic or social distinctions.

The other feature of the Kingdom is that the basis of economic distribution is *need*. Its watchword, to which the writer repeatedly returns, is: To each according to his need, and from each according to his ability. This is reinforced by an argument from the family. In a family each member gets his share of whatever there is according to his need. If all life was ruled by God's will, as embodied in Christ, there would be no 'needy' person at all. 'That word "need" is the axis around which human problems will revolve in the future.'

That briefly is as good a picture as we can give of what is in the writer's mind. He has chapters on Fascism and Naziism which are not conspicuous for sympathetic understanding. They are valuable, however, for the quotations they contain from authoritative totalitarian manifestoes. But the substance of the book is what has been stated above. There will be wide acceptance of one of its main contentions, that the coming of God's Kingdom, as Christ preached it, would mean a thoroughgoing change in the structure of our social and economic system. And the earnestness and sincerity with which this is urged will make a deep impression on the open-minded reader.

But it must be frankly said that there are many open and sympathetic minds that will be inclined to put some large queries opposite some of the writer's statements. Is it true, for one, that in a Christian society need will be the basis of economic distribution? This goes beyond the classic socialist demand: 'to each according to his *services*, from each according to his ability,' which seems both more ethical and more Christian. The family is a bad precedent. For in a family the members only get according to their need when they are children or ailing. And for another query, must there be economic sameness to produce real unity in a society? Will there ever be a society, so long as human beings are human, where there are no social and economic distinctions? Do these not exist even in Russia?

But these are lesser matters, and the strained exegesis of Scripture which is not uncommon, and the tendency to 'press' arguments, are still lesser. What has to be said and emphasized about this book is that it is a really noble challenge to conventional Christianity. The acceptance of Christ's will is not merely an individual renewal. It would mean a renewal of society from top to bottom, and a radical reconstruction of its basis. If this book succeeds in getting its readers to face that issue it will have done a great service.

LOVE AND JOHN WESLEY.

Mrs. G. Elsie Harrison has made a racy, fascinating, and valuable addition to the literature that deals with John Wesley—*Son to Susanna: The Private Life of John Wesley* (Nicholson & Watson; 8s. 6d. net). Mrs. Harrison, as the title shows, limits her studies primarily to the private life; and readers will soon discover that the aspect exhibited is mainly his relations with women. Before we look at these, let us make some remarks of a general nature about the book.

As to style it is charming. It abounds in graceful and apt literary allusion. It is 'impressionistic,' bringing a scene vividly before the reader's mind with a few deft strokes. The authoress shares in the portrait-painting of Dickens and the whimsicality of Barrie. In short, the book is a sheer delight to read.

The 'debunking' so common in our time is too often tempted or apt to do violence to history—

poor John Knox has been a notable sufferer. Not the least of the merits of this treatment of Wesley is that nothing is asserted which is not borne out by the diligent research on which Mrs. Harrison bases her study. Nor as to the central figures can we find that fair balance has not been kept. Our one doubt is as to whether the hymn-writing brother Charles is not set in too unrelievedly unfavourable light. That in character he was far from the equal of John is universally admitted; but here he seldom appears except as a parasite and a nuisance, and in the most thrilling section of the book about Grace Murray, as a scoundrel.

The first woman with whom John Wesley was concerned was, of course, his mother. So close were the bonds between them that John never escaped her influence; to the end he was the 'son of Susanna.' Mrs. Harrison gives a very racy account of the extraordinary *ménage* into which John was born; the blustering, pompous ex-dissenter, High-Church father; the practical, clear-sighted, long-suffering mother; the problem of debt and many mouths; the fire from which John, still a child, was rescued, which he never forgot, and which may well have caused a 'complex.'

John had a surprising number of love-affairs. We lose all patience with this tardy wooer who never could propose in time, and allowed the prizes to be carried off by more impulsive and ardent hands. John was cursed with a certain indecision. Even when he was a young boy, 'I will consider of it' was often on his lips. As to matrimony he 'considered' too long. It seems most probable that Nature had designed him for celibacy. He loved women in a brotherly way. He found their conversation profitable and pleasant; he loved to correspond with them; they appealed to him intellectually, æsthetically, and spiritually. The beautiful girls, however, whom he 'dangled' after, were not likely to be satisfied with just that. With all their spirituality they remained normally-constituted, healthy, young women who aspired to wifehood and motherhood. John does not seem to have been quite aware of such things. Then tragically by one of life's ironies, after a series of valuable losses through his own procrastination, he married in haste one who was utterly unsuitable, a thorn in the flesh to buffet him.

This is Mrs. Harrison's main story, and she makes this transcript from real life as thrilling as any novel. It must be understood, however, that interwoven with this tale of folly and tragedy in love, is an excellent and penetrating account of John's spiritual pilgrimage and of the development of that most real love of his for God and for sinners which made of him the evangelist who transformed the face of England, and probably saved our country from the horrors of a revolution such as France underwent. Two events in particular are movingly described, Wesley's 'warming of the heart' and his death. Yet it is almost unfair to single them out from a whole which is of such uniformly high standard.

JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

Under the general name 'Judaism and Christianity,' a second volume of essays has been published by the Sheldon Press—*The Contact of Pharisaism with Other Cultures*—and edited by Mr. Herbert Loewe (12s. 6d. net). Like its predecessor, of which it is a real continuation, the new book consists of lectures given by both Jewish and Christian scholars. Thus Mr. Loewe himself describes the ideals of Pharisaism, and Dr. E. Rosenthal the relations between Judaism and early Islam, while Rabbi L. Rabinowitz draws a vivid picture of Jewry in thirteenth-century France. On the Christian side, Canon W. L. Knox discusses Pharisaism and Hellenism, with an estimate of Philo which will be new to many readers; and the Rev. J. Parkes sketches the attitude of the Empire to Judaism, with special reference to the theological controversy with the Early Church. A lecture by Dr. G. G. Coulton on the Feudal period has been edited by Mr. A. C. Adcock, who also contributes an illuminating account of the fortunes of the Jews during the Reformation period, while the last chapter is by Dr. H. F. Stewart, and forms a comparative study of Jewish and Jesuitical dialectics. The outstanding feature of the whole is the strong sympathy with which each side regards the other; as Mr. Loewe remarks in his preface, 'the separate essays have not needed reconciliation.' If it be not invidious to select special chapters, it is in the work of Mr. Loewe himself and of Dr. Parkes that we are most conscious of this ability to take another's point of view. Both writers give evidence of profound scholarship—few living Christians can know Judaism as well as Dr. Parkes does—but it would be difficult to point to any feature of the work of either which indicated a strong preference for one religion or the other, though, on independent grounds, we know that each is a steadfast adherent of his own faith. Rabbi Rabinowitz, Dr. Coulton, and Mr. Adcock deal with subjects of which the average reader will know very little, and they throw a flood of light on the periods under discussion.

Mr. Adcock, in particular, helps us to realize how important was the part played in the Reformation by the Christian revival of Hebrew studies. The other essays, if less striking than these, are quite their equal in learning and in attractive presentation of their subjects. 'Pharisaism,' however, is somewhat misleading till we have read Mr. Loewe's explanation of the term. It was the Pharisaic side of Judaism that survived the catastrophe of A.D. 70, and the word is used of orthodox Judaism from that time onwards. The book, alike for its scholarship and for its interest, deserves to be read by all who have an interest in the history and thought of either Judaism or Christianity.

THE NAGAS.

The Rengma Nagas, by Mr. J. P. Mills, M.A., I.C.S. (Macmillan; 25s. net), is one of those ethnographical surveys which aim at preserving a record of the customs and traditions of a small and rapidly disappearing community. The particular tribe to which Mr. Mills has devoted such careful study are, he claims, a body of 'unspoilt primitive people' living among the mountains to the east of Assam, bordering on Burma. They are rapidly, under the influence of the American Baptist Mission which works among them, abandoning many of their old and, no doubt, often evil, ways and becoming Christianized. The interest of the student of primitive anthropology is different from that of the Christian evangelist, but their interests need not conflict, and it is important that the missionary should realize what is good as well as what is harmful in the ancient folk-ways of the people among whom he works, and should accept the help and advice of one like Mr. Mills in discriminating between these.

Thus, no one would suggest that head-hunting—even though its aim is to increase the fertility of the crops and the cattle—should be maintained, but there are customs that are less easily judged. One of these is that which relates to what the Nagas call the 'morung.' This is, Mr. Mills says, 'a club far more strictly preserved from feminine intrusion than any club in England,' to which the adolescent boy goes when it seems shameful to him to sleep any longer in the same room as his parents. It is there he learns the discipline of his fellows, but it is evident that he may learn much else as well that is not good. In undermining this institution the Mission, according to Mr. Mills, 'is taking a very dangerous step from which they would assuredly have shrunk if they had considered the psychological aspect of the matter.' Similarly, in the case of the 'bride-price,' Mr. Mills holds that this payment is not 'an immoral sale of the girl,' but 'compensation for her leaving the clan, and of immense moral value.' How to preserve the good in such customs and guard against the evil is a problem that concerns those who are seeking to help such primitive people everywhere, and much harm has come from careless or ignorant handling of what reaches far down into the life of a people. A book like this of Mr. Mills, so full of intimate knowledge and understanding of these helpless children, who are so easily injured irretrievably by our contact with them, even while we are eager to help them, should be fully considered and its warnings heeded.

It is quite superfluous to commend a study which is so manifestly thorough and intimate as this of Mr. Mills. He writes as one who not only knows his people but has a real affection for them, and who sees clearly and laments the dangers that threaten them. 'New cultures,' he says, 'must inevitably impinge upon them, and that it should destroy them is painful to those who love them.' That the missionaries love them quite as much no one can doubt. Co-operation between those who are agreed in seeking the good of such primitive children, whether of India or Africa, or of any other land, is much to be desired and ought to be attainable.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH'S TEACHING.

A very interesting and in some ways satisfying book has been written by the Rev. Wilfred L. Knox and the Rev. Alec. R. Vidler, both priests of the Oratory of the Good Shepherd, on *The Gospel of God and the Authority of the Church* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). The explanation of the dual title is that the authors have set out to answer the two questions, (1) What is the Christian Gospel? and (2) In what sense is the teaching of the Church authoritative? It will be noticed that the second question differs slightly from what the title suggests. It is the authority of the Church's *teaching* the book deals with, not that of the Church itself. And authority is defined as 'title to be believed.' It is sharply distinguished from infallibility. And this distinction is emphasized by the modest claim made for the Church's rendering of the gospel, that it is 'not a final or intellectually adequate statement of revelation' but 'the best available account of it,' or 'a working hypothesis which is being continually confirmed,' and 'a reliable guide, which is adequate for all practical purposes, to the experience of revelation, *i.e.*, to the experience of God revealed in the Person of Christ.'

Lest this may seem to leave the authority concerned in the air we are pointed to the experience of the saints as the final confirmation of the doctrine. The history of the Church, in this sense, is the best confirmation of the truth of the Catholic faith. This or that statement may be liable to error, but 'as a developing whole Christian doctrine is entitled to be accepted as providing . . . adequate guidance to the practice of the Christian life.' All this is worked out with charm and intelligence. Incidentally there are two passages of special value on Form-Criticism and on the claim to papal infallibility. It would be difficult to find a clearer criticism of this claim in brief compass.

Language owing to its ambiguities is by no means a perfect instrument of argumentation. The simple word 'is,' for example, may signify existence, or identity, or inclusion in a class, or implication. In this respect language differs from mathematics where symbols are used with precision and chains of reasoning are firmly linked. Naturally, therefore, thinkers of a mathematical turn of mind have sought to give to logic the precision of mathematics by creating a system of symbols which could be defined with accuracy. Reasoning could then be conducted by means of a series of mathematical equations. The classical example of this is the 'Principia Mathematica' of Whitehead and Russell. That work, however, is to the general reader a mystery through its cabalistic symbolism. *An Introduction to Symbolic Logic* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net) has now been written by Susanne K. Langer which helps to let daylight in on the whole subject. It is written with admirable clearness, and there is no reason why any one, with a little care and patience, may not follow the exposition and become familiar with the symbols. The writer is an enthusiastic admirer of the work of Whitehead and claims that the use of symbols has greatly extended the power of logic. 'If any one has ever been awed by Nature's miracle, namely, that "Large oaks from little acorns grow," surely he will be moved to respect a Science of Logic that derives, by rigorous proofs, all the facts of mathematics from the forms of propositions.' Many, however, it is to be feared, will manifest their respect by maintaining a respectful distance from the whole subject!

China is very much in the public mind at present, and it is opportune that a little book should be issued telling of the work of the Church Missionary Society in that land. Its title is *The Way of Partnership* (C.M.S.; 1s.), and it is written by Mrs. Gwendolen R. Barclay and others. Mrs. Barclay, the wife of the C.M.S. Far Eastern Secretary, visited the China Missions in the winter of 1936-1937, and she gives here some account of them, with the help of missionaries who each deal with their own special branch of the work. We have chapters on Student Life, Village Life, Hospital Work, Women's Work, etc. The narratives, though brief, are highly interesting and are packed full of information.

Edward Irving is one of the most puzzling and pathetic figures in the religious history of the nineteenth century. Endowed with wonderful gifts that seemed capable of lifting him to the topmost heights, he yet, for lack of something in the way of essential balance, went off the rails and literally tore himself to pieces. His biography by Mrs. Oliphant has long been a standard work, but it does not exhaust the field, and it leaves ample room for a fresh treatment. This is given in *Edward Irving and his Circle*, by the Rev. Andrew Landale Drummond, Ph.D., B.D., S.T.M. (James Clarke; 8s. 6d. net). The work is very competently and sympathetically done. The writer succeeds in giving a truly living picture of Irving. But the special value of his book lies in its comprehensive treatment of the phenomena connected with the gift of tongues. This whole subject is now much better understood than it was in Irving's day through psychological research, and the relevant material is here presented with clearness and sanity so that the reader is guided to a reasonable judgment upon it. For this alone the book is well worth reading, and it deserves an honoured place on the shelf of religious biography.

Principal Harrison, B.Sc., D.D., of Westminster Training College, London, has contributed to Duckworth's Theology series an account of *Arminianism* (5s. net). The story of Arminianism is a long one. It began early in the seventeenth century as a rebellion against rigorous Calvinism, and more or less the controversy has continued ever since. The pendulum of theological thought has swung between the two poles, and in our own day there has been in some quarters a swing back towards Calvinism. It is not only a long story but it is far from easy to tell. It cannot be made intelligible without a great amount of detail as to individual teachers, and there is a risk that for the ordinary reader that mass of details will prove repulsive and unmanageable. This hard task of giving sufficient detail and remaining interesting has been splendidly achieved by Dr. Harrison. Of special interest, of course, are the passages dealing with the reception of Arminianism in England by the school of Laud, the Cambridge Platonists, the later Latitudinarians, and, most interesting of all, by the great evangelical Wesley.

The beginner in the study of Comparative Religion will find *The Elements of Comparative Theology*, by the Rev. F. Harold Smith, D.D. (Duckworth; 5s. net.), an exceedingly useful introduction. It is elementary in the sense that it does not presuppose much previous knowledge—indeed the author occasionally seems to underrate the intelligence of his readers—but it is comprehensive, accurate, and written with commendable clarity. The method of treatment is perhaps a little artificial. Dr. Smith makes use of five categories of ideas—of Sacred Literature, God, Cosmology, the Good Life, and Salvation, and applies them in turn to the various religions. This results in an admirable presentation of the teachings of the religions on these topics separately, but does not permit easily of a *total* view of any one religion, and is apt to lead to unnecessary repetition. It is questionable, also, whether, under the first category, the idea of inspiration is not unduly narrowed to verbal inspiration, and thus rendered less adequate for discriminative application to the different religions. Under Cosmology, the idea of creation *ex nihilo* seems to be hardly sufficiently analysed, but the difficult distinction between creation and emanation is effectively made.

By far the best chapter in the book is that on 'Man and the Good Life.' The basic requirements of ethics are applied for the purpose of an illuminating classification of religions, and we have rarely come across so adequate a short summary of the teachings of the Vedānta and of Buddhism on the topics belonging to this section. The author is better at particularizing description than at generalizations, and his exposition of the parallel Christian teaching is disappointingly slight; but probably this conciseness is due to the assumption that for the majority of his readers fuller treatment is unnecessary in view of the knowledge they already possess. As a whole, the book is a most excellent short presentation of the fundamental conceptions of the prominent world-religions—Shintoism, Confucianism, Taoism, Hinduism, Muhammadanism, and Christianity.

The title of the latest volume by the Reverend James Reid, D.D., is *The Temple in the Heart* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). The title comes from the first study—'The true place of worship is not a geographical locality. It is not a special place at all. God is not localized in any particular spot or building. It is in the temple within the heart we must find Him.' There are altogether sixty-three short studies in this volume marked by all the qualities that we associate with Dr. Reid's work—deep spirituality, evangelical fervour, penetrating thought, and all couched in simple direct language. Most if not all of the studies have already appeared in 'The British Weekly.' Many who have read them there will be glad to have them in book form to use for devotional reading.

All interested in Christian mysticism of the best type may be warmly recommended to a perusal of *Saint John of the Cross, 1542–1591*, by Father Bede Frost, O.S.B. (Hodder & Stoughton; 18s. net). The book describes itself as an introduction to the Saint's philosophy, theology, and spirituality. It is a work of high scholarly merit by one who has to a great extent thought himself into the standpoint of his hero, and who inspires confidence that his exposition of the teaching of St. John is thoroughly adequate.

A third edition has been issued of Professor C. J. Cadoux's *Roman Catholicism and Freedom* (Independent Press; 5s. net). Some new points and answers to criticisms are appended. The book has had a wonderful circulation; a second edition was called for within six months of the first in 1936, and now a third has been found necessary, for which, we are confident, there will also be a large sale. In view of this conspicuous success we are inclined to deprecate the reprinting of the preface to the second edition, in which the learned author complained of the ignoring of his book by a large section of the Press, attributing this to Roman Catholic influence.

Not all sermons given in school chapels are worth publishing, but Mr. Sydney Moore's '*Wherewithal . . .*' (Independent Press; 3s. 6d. net) is an outstanding example of what such addresses should be. Mr. Moore is well acquainted with the results of Biblical scholarship; his religion is an experiential one and he knows his audience. He neither speaks down to it nor does he dwell on experiences which boys still at a public school could not share in. We have quoted from one of the addresses in 'The Christian Year,' and we would commend the volume to all interested in the religious education of the young.

A short course of lectures delivered last Spring in Sion College has been enlarged by the lecturer, the Rev. L. E. Elliott-Binns, D.D., and published with the title *England and the New Learning* (Lutterworth Press; 2s. 6d. net). In the first, which deals with the New Learning in Europe and English pioneers, the author does good service in demolishing the prevalent delusion that the Renaissance was due to the Fall of Constantinople. On the contrary, it was in Italy a revival of classical culture, and when Constantinople fell it marked an end rather than a beginning, for it meant that search in that city for ancient manuscripts, which had been going on for a long time previously, came to a sudden end. We have in this lecture a clarifying discussion on what the Renaissance meant beyond the Alps in contrast to Italy. The second lecture deals with Colet and More at Oxford, and the third with Fisher and Erasmus at Cambridge. The fourth, in some ways most interesting of all, deals with the complicated question as to how the New Learning and the Reformation were related. The New Learning, in brief, created a new atmosphere, increased the value of the individual and, most fruitful of all, insisted on sound method and sound learning which drove men back to a study of the original basis of Christianity in the Scriptures.

The Origin of Heathendom, by Mr. Ben Adam (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 2s. 6d. net), is an ingenious and interesting book. The writer shows considerable knowledge of Hebrew, and he engages in a careful study of certain Old Testament words. He treats the early narratives of Genesis as divinely inspired history, and although many readers will be unable to follow him in this, they will find here grounds for reflecting that there may be more in these ancient stories than they may have supposed. His argument is that the human race was scattered by a penal act of God who split up the primeval unity of the dry land into its several continents. The theory of a primeval united continent has very respectable geological evidence in support of it, much more than is indicated in this book, but probably no geologist would place the great divide at a date after the human race had appeared on the earth. The closing chapters of the book deal with the obscure subject of the union of the sons of God with the daughters of men, and the resulting race of the Rephaim.

Dr. Campbell Morgan has published a very excellent little book on *Preaching* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 2s. 6d. net). It is short but much to the point. It is full of good things, thoroughly practical, and lit up with illustrations and touches of humour. He holds the essentials of preaching to be Truth, Clarity, and Passion. He bases all preaching on the Word; and in answer to the question, Why have a text? he gives three reasons: 'first, the authority that is in the text as being a part of the Word of God; second, the definiteness which it must give, when properly dealt with, to the Christian message; and finally, the maintenance of variety.' He is all for careful exegesis. 'I would rather have Westcott on John than all the devotional books on that Gospel that I have ever seen.'

The anthropomorphism which dominates the earlier strata of the Old Testament is hardly a serious problem for the modern scholar. If higher criticism had done nothing else, it would have justified itself by its rearrangement of the Biblical material in historical order. We are thus enabled to see the steady, if slow, process of divine revelation, and we are no longer surprised or shocked at finding statements and views in the Old Testament which appear to conflict with the fuller knowledge of God. The Rabbis of the early Christian centuries, however, had no such apologetic weapon in their hands, and were deeply concerned by the evidence of inadequate theology suggested in many Old Testament passages. Their attempts to solve the problem have been ably presented and discussed by Dr. Marmorstein in his *Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God: II. Essays in Anthropomorphism* (Milford; 5s. net). Through succeeding generations of Jewish scholars he traces the conflict between two schools of interpretation, the allegorical and the literal. The former may avoid theological difficulties, but numbers of learned and devout Jews felt that it did not do justice to the method and purpose of revelation. Some other means of escape had to be found, as, for instance, the humble statement 'we should not have dared to think this, unless it had stood in the Bible.' Dr. Marmorstein's work, published under the auspices of the Jews' College, will be of interest, not only to his co-religionists, but also to Christian students of the Bible.

With obvious fitness the editors of 'The Clarendon Bible' have entrusted the most theological of the epistles of Paul to one of the most distinguished theologians in the Church of England. Canon K. E. Kirk's exposition of Romans—*The Epistle to the Romans* (Milford; 4s. 6d. net)—is at once a welcome complement and an interesting contrast to that of a no less distinguished New Testament scholar, Professor C. H. Dodd, in 'The Moffatt New Testament Commentary.' The latter, in his Introduction, gives four pages to 'the thought of the Epistle'; the former, in one hundred pages, on 'the main ideas of the Epistle,' provides what is really a substantial treatise on Pauline theology. This difference is significant. Canon Kirk, as a systematic theologian, is concerned to reduce to order Paul's deplorably unsystematic presentation of Christian truth. At the same time he strives to show that the apostle's conception of Christianity is at all points 'Catholic,' not 'Protestant.' Those who do not share his outlook will often find him more stimulating than convincing, but perhaps just for that reason it is they who will profit most from the study of his book. They may also feel that he lacks—in notable contrast to Professor Dodd—that sympathetic understanding of Paul which is the best guide in the intrepretation of difficult passages. The commentary proper is by comparison brief, and sometimes seems a little perfunctory (see, for example, the note on 8^{28}, which does little more than refer the reader to 'the larger commentaries').

An Ambassador in Chains, by the Rt. Rev. Arthur B. L. Karney, D.D. (Mowbray; 5s. net), does not in its title give any indication of its contents. In the main it is a popular exposition of St. Paul's 'Prison Epistles'—Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon—with the addition of five short chapters on 'Paul's Prison Prayers.' The writer, who is Bishop of Southampton, is anxious for the revival of expository preaching, and in an introductory chapter he discusses, in a very suggestive and helpful way, the whole problem of church services. The expositions themselves will be found to be scholarly and full of help for popular preaching.

Our Noble Heritage, by the Rev. J. Findlater (Roberts; 4s. net), is an earnest plea to British Protestants to guard against the danger of losing the heritage of gospel truth and ordered liberty won at the Reformation. The writer sees the hidden hand of Rome in many of the sinister policies of the time. He has much to say about the doctrine of election, and is confident enough to imagine that if he could have pointed out certain things to Calvin, 'that great and good man would have come to agree with me.' And after a similar demonstration, Martin Luther 'from his warm-hearted soul would have thanked me for thus filling in that part of the picture which he had left blank.'

A new, and entirely rewritten, edition of a book which has been useful and much used since it was first issued in 1916 has been published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge—*The Christian's Claim about Jesus of Nazareth; Perfect God and Perfect Man*, by the Rev. Clement F. Rogers, M.A. (2s. net). The lectures on which the book is based were given in one form or another seven times in Hyde Park and more frequently to theological students in King's College and elsewhere. The titles of the chapters are: What the First Christians Thought about Christ, Did Jesus of Nazareth Claim to be Divine? Is the Christian Claim Credible? and Non-Christian Alternatives to the Christian Belief about Christ. This is an excellent piece of Christian apologetic, all the better for being 'popular.'

A series of liturgical, expository, and homiletical studies in the Gospels and Epistles for the Church year is published under the title, *The Eternal Word in the Modern World*, by Professor Burton S. Easton and Professor H. C. Robbins (Scribners; 8s. 6d. net). These studies originated in what may be called clinical work. One of the writers is Professor of the Interpretation of the New Testament, the other of Pastoral Theology. The former set themes for the students, the other criticised the students' performances. Out of all this, in a way not clearly explained, these 'expository notes' have arisen. The word 'liturgical,' applied to some of these outlines, means sermons dealing with the parts of Scripture selected by the Church to be read in the service.

The authors are neither Fundamentalists nor Modernists. They repudiate both, and declare their adherence to the Liberal Catholic and Liberal Evangelical standpoint. They accept the positive and constructive results of New Testament criticism, and also the Nicene theology as a revelation to the Church by the Holy Spirit of the mystery of the Person of Christ. The book is written from this standpoint. The Epistles and Gospels for Sundays in each part of the Christian year are taken, and then the Epistles and Gospels for Holy Days. There are historical and critical notes by way of introduction, followed by very full sermon outlines. The eminence of the writers guarantees the scholarship, and the practical origin of the discourses sufficiently assures the homiletic value of the work.

If the many who are interested in the missionary activities of the Church to-day are too exclusively occupied with their present obligations and opportunities, *The English Missionaries in Sweden and Finland*, by Mr. C. J. A. Oppermann, M.A., Ph.D. (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net), will be of service to those especially of Anglo-Saxon descent, and make them feel that they have entered upon a great heritage. We are told that one of the chief characteristics of the early Anglo-Saxon Church was its zeal for missionary work, and we have here a record, careful, well-documented, and obviously the outcome of immense industry, of one of the earliest objectives of its missionary activity. It is probably known to comparatively few that the Church in Sweden owes its inception largely to the labours of English missionaries. Dr. Oppermann traces the historical development of this work, the bitter struggle with heathenism, the religious significance of the Viking raids, the successes and the failures, the divided counsels amongst the missionaries as to the best methods, their relations to the various overlords, always difficult to handle, and their own plans for the organization and continuance of the Church. He is most interesting in his account of the labours of the missionary bishops, less so in his presentation of the gradual emergence of a missionary episcopate, and in his account of the various devices by which the Scandinavian countries were brought under the centralized rule of the papacy. It is curious—in view of modern parallels—to note how calmly it was assumed in these early days that the decision, by a majority vote, of a Council could determine the religion of a whole people. Evidently some of the problems of present-day missionary policy would have been more easily solved from the point of view of these early missionaries; and it is rather startling to find how frequently the Anglo-Swedish pioneers resembled Elijah in his treatment of the prophets of Baal. But the lesson was gradually learnt in Sweden, as elsewhere, that force or high-handedness is of no avail in the upbuilding of the Christian Church, and that only in peaceful penetration lies the hope of continuance.

A notable addition to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge's 'Transactions of Early Documents' has been made by the Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, D.D., in *The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians* (4s. 6d. net). On the Apostolic Fathers Lightfoot remains the great English authority, but Lightfoot did not say the final word. Knowledge has increased since his time, and fruitful discussion has abounded. Of that newer knowledge Dr. Clarke is fully abreast. He gives an admirable translation of Clement, and clarifies difficulties in excellent notes. All this is preceded by brief but illuminating discussions on the Church in Rome, the fate of Paul and Peter, church-organization in the Epistle, its theology and leading ideas, the difficult problem occasioned by its failure to quote from our Gospels, the use made of other New Testament writings, and so on. The work aims at letting the ordinary reader know of this important early Christian document and what light it casts upon the Church at the end of the first century. For that purpose as well as for its scholarly qualities, which will make it very useful to all students of the early days of Christianity, we cordially welcome it.

The Saints of Egypt (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net), by the Rev. De Lacy O'Leary, D.D., Lecturer at Bristol University, is published for the Church Historical Society. The author, who has already written learnedly on the Coptic Church, aims in these pages at providing a compendium of information about the martyrs and other saints honoured in the Coptic Church. He has followed, for the most part, the biographies given in the Jacobite (Egyptian) Synaxarium, but has given some additional matter necessary for the illustration of those lives. The catalogue has been arranged alphabetically and may be readily consulted. The first part of the book, which is nearly one-fourth of the whole, treats of the foundation of the Church of Alexandria, the Coptic language, the Egyptian martyrs, Egyptian monasticism, sources for the lives of the saints, and the Coptic calendar. It is a learned and scholarly work and has all the appearance of being reliable.

The Student Christian Movement Press has issued a very useful little guide to the divisions of the Church and to its reunions, edited by the Rev. E. G. Parry—*The Divisions of the Church: A Historical Guide* (1s. net). Its aim is to give some information as to the origin and features of the churches represented at the second World Conference on Faith and Order, and to reveal what reunions have already taken place. The information is accurate, and while, from the nature of the case, the treatment is slight, yet by its clear and concise presentation of the basal facts, frequently assisted by diagrams, the pamphlet—for it is no more—will prove interesting and instructive.

Christianity in Action.

Canon H. R. L. Sheppard, C.H., D.D.

By the Reverend H. L. Johnston, M.C., M.A., Rector of Cranleigh, Surrey.

The passing of Canon H. R. L. Sheppard has made many stop to re-think the value which they had put on his work. When he was alive it was so easy, because this or that aspect of his work seemed incompatible with cherished traditions, to write off all that he stood for as being the outcome of an unbalanced, even though an exceptionally attractive, personality. But during these last two months it has been less difficult to get a truer perspective, and some of the things that have been disclosed have forced many to think again.

The Dean of St. Paul's, in an exceptionally discerning tribute at his funeral, referred to him as a primitive Christian who could not be expected to be completely at home in this modern world, and as one who was prepared to make of himself a fool for Christ. If these two thoughts are traced back through some of his outstanding activities, it may help to show the way in which he manifested Christianity in action in the world to-day.

While he loved the Church in which he had been brought up and into whose ministry he was ordained in 1907, he was for ever breaking away from conventions and from the letter of ecclesiastical tradition, and making the true heart of Christianity shine through the normal and more stereotyped forms of Church life. As chaplain and afterwards Head of Oxford House his insuppressible vitality poured itself out in binding all and sundry, from the East End or the West, to himself with bonds of personal affection, and then diverting the response to his infectious goodness into the highest channels. In those days, though few might have dared to speak of him as 'the most Christlike man I ever knew,' many have confessed that their knowledge of their Lord and Saviour came to them through what they felt reflected in his life.

Seldom in bed before 2 a.m. or after 6 a.m., his constitution was unable to stand the strain, and he was compelled to resign from Oxford House. Before his ordination he had acted as private secretary to the present Archbishop of Canterbury—who was then Bishop of Stepney: once more during his convalescence he joined him as his assistant Chaplain at York.

It was during this period that he conceived the idea of a West End Club having as its motive and background the ideal of Christian service: after his return to London to take charge of St. Mary's, Bourdon Street, this took shape and the Cavendish Club was opened. The idea of a club with these ideals for laymen, to which no parson was admitted for ordinary membership, but which yet had a chapel and a chaplain, even called for comment in *Punch*. But those of the two thousand original members who survive will testify that he was able to infect the club with the real spirit of Christianity which sought its outlet in practical social service of all kinds. The idea of men's religion being helped to find expression in the normal and natural surroundings of their everyday lives is one that has not even yet begun to be developed. As the problem of the Parochial system, at any rate in towns, appears to be increasingly difficult, it may be that the line he took is one that might well be further explored at the present time.

On the face of it, the natural associations in which men are banded together are surely the ground on which there is most likely to be a response to the highest values of life, and the best chance of finding expression for corporate worship and true Christianity. Factories, combines, firms, industries, associations, clubs, and common interests may yet indicate the new forms of parish boundaries into which the energies of an evangelizing Church can best be poured in modern days. And those few firms who have had the courage to go beyond a 'welfare worker,' and definitely employ chaplains to care for the souls and minds and bodies of their employees, would probably have tales to tell that would make the subject-matter of Diocesan Conferences seem trivial.

After a period in charge of the Grosvenor Chapel he was in 1914 appointed vicar of St. Martin-in-the-Fields. After two months at the Front, attached to an Australian Auxiliary Hospital which went overseas with the Expeditionary Force, he settled down to face this new sphere. The present vicar of St. Martin's, when Canon Sheppard's body was brought to his old church to rest, read to those who were gathered there an extract from the first sermon he preached on the Sunday after his induction. It gave a vision of what he believed that church, set at the very heart of the Empire, might be allowed to stand for, and the part it might play in the lives of those who would otherwise pass by on the other side.

That vision was fulfilled within ten years, and it was fulfilled because all his gifts of imagination, foresight, patience, organization, business capacity, and leadership were shot through with love of ordinary people, the kind of love that reflected to men the love of God revealed in Jesus Christ.

It would seem of little use to tell of what he did at St. Martin's except to those who had the chance of knowing what he was to all and sundry during those years. But certain facts must be chronicled because they imply more than the bare narrative can convey.

In 1915 a simple choral Communion service at 10.15 on Sundays was started: within the year the notice appeared that 'the church is now free and open, and no sittings are allotted.' In May 1916 the dinner-hour services were inaugurated, and with the Bishop of London's permission laymen were invited to give the addresses. In October 1916 it was decided that the church should be kept open all night as well as all day, so that those who were homeless or stranded might take shelter there. The following month the Bishop's sanction was obtained for an altered form of morning service on Sundays: and about the same time the 'Guild of Fellowship' began to take shape. In March of 1917 the first of the special Sunday afternoon services for men and women in uniform was held, the music being provided by a band lent by one of the Guards Regiments. After demobilization the service was continued (and still is) as a service for the people, *i.e.* for those who do not at present attend the regular services of the church. In September of the same year the hour's music on Saturday afternoons was introduced, about which the vicar wrote in his Magazine: 'I am clear that the more our church is used for what is beautiful the more we will be loved, and the more our regular services will call to our people to worship the Lord of all Beauty.' Another innovation was the use to which he put the period after the evening service on Sunday. He would invite speakers to give a thirty to forty-five minutes' talk, or a lantern lecture, on all kinds of different subjects, social, philanthropic, missionary, or historical; it often proved that nearly three-quarters of the large congregation at the evening service were glad to stop for such talks, whereas probably only a handful would have come together for special meetings and addresses on the same subjects.

On the day of the Armistice and for the two following days the church was packed day and night, and special commemoration services were held at intervals when 'we prayed for strength and grace to stand the strain of peace.'

In 1919 the vicar wrote in the Magazine: 'I should be perfectly willing to have an evening Communion if actual names of those unable to receive their Communion at the ordinary hours when it is offered were sent me. I am quite willing to meet a perfectly genuine and legitimate demand, but I am not in this respect willing to create one.' It is noteworthy that the evidence for this demand was not considered adequate for another five years, but in 1924 the following note appeared: 'Many have criticised but many more have approved our action in starting evening Communion once a month. The expressions of thanks from those who came to the service on 6th April were more than enough to convince us that our motive in starting the service was the right one.' This service was held once a month, separated from the ordinary evening service by an interval of one hour.

In 1923 Armistice Day fell on a Sunday, and the Home Office for the first time in history allowed a religious meeting in Trafalgar Square. It took the form of a simple service, the music being played by a massed band of the Guards, and the addresses given by Mr. Sheppard and Mr. Ritchie. Two years later many will remember that as a result of a letter from Mr. Sheppard to the *Times* entitled 'Is it in Keeping?' a charity ball arranged for Armistice Night at the Albert Hall was at the last moment postponed, and its place taken by a special Service of Commemoration. This single-handed effort undoubtedly did more than anything else towards preserving the due observance of Armistice Day up and down the country.

On 6th January 1924, the first religious service was broadcast from a church: the experiment was made at the request of the religious Committee of the B.B.C., and as a result of the experience gained from this first service from St. Martin's, Mr. Sheppard expressed his opinion that such a service might well be broadcast regularly, not more than once a month, and that at an hour when evening services are not being held elsewhere.

The B.B.C. then asked for a service to be broadcast each month from St. Martin's, and it was only when he had found out that neither St. Paul's nor Westminster Abbey were prepared to undertake it that Mr. Sheppard consented to accede to this request. The first of the regular broadcast services on the second Sunday in the month was held on 13th April 1924.

The years 1924–26 saw the gradual failure of Mr. Sheppard's health under the unceasing strain he put on his mind and body, and in September of 1926 he found it necessary to give notice of his intended resignation from St. Martin's. Such is the bare outline of some of the more familiar features of his ministry at St. Martin's, but no chronicle can hope to convey any impression of the spirit which animated him, and with which he filled the church which he served.

His amazing sympathy with and understanding of the needs of ordinary people was the source of all such experiments as he made; some of them are the commonplaces of Church life and activity to-day, and it is difficult to remember the extent to which he was a pioneer. His was an almost unerring touch on human nature, and in many ways he was able to provide for the expression of people's deepest aspirations and longings before even they had realized their own need for such expression.

He was convinced that the formalism and coldness of churches and their apparent aloofness from ordinary life could be overcome without even for a moment losing anything of the truth or the depths of spiritual experience to which they were a witness. He translated the Church to the people, and showed its readiness to try and meet their needs and to stretch out a helping hand of love to those who were neglected and little loved. The opening of the church all night as a shelter for those who were stranded or homeless did not stop at merely providing an alternative to the streets, but every effort was made under his guidance to put men and women in touch with other agencies of mercy and of passing many of them on to the St. Martin's Hostel, which has done and is doing so much to get men on to their feet again, and back once more to work.

The week-day services and the addresses on every conceivable topic, and the Saturday and Sunday music were used to supply the needs of the mental and æsthetic side of human nature, and all that contributed to the true fullness of life seemed to him to have a natural place in the activities of a church.

But when all is said and done, it was the way in which he used the services of the Church and all its activities to shed abroad the love of God in men's hearts that will remain the abiding memory of his ministry at St. Martin's.

There followed three years of complete inactivity, crippled by frequent and intense bouts of asthma and consequent sleeplessness. During this period the scope and variety of his reading was prodigious. But cut off from all the activity of life, and unable to immerse himself in the work that he loved, his restless spirit was for ever questioning the true values for which the Church stood, and seeing them overlaid by a wealth of trivialities which seemed to bear no real relation to the way of life revealed by our Lord. Some of the doubts and questionings that haunted him found expression in the book he put out before the Lambeth Conference *The Impatience of a Parson*. Had he allowed himself to be content with being merely destructive, this book would possibly have had an even greater influence within the Church than it actually did have among those on the outskirts of Church life.

His appointment to the Deanery of Canterbury in 1929 came just at a time when his health had sufficiently improved to make it likely that he would be completely restored in what seemed to offer the opportunity of quiet and not too exacting work.

Canterbury Cathedral and all that it might stand for as the central shrine of the Church of England inspired him with a passionate devotion. He quickly showed that though 'no man cared less for externals; no one was more scrupulously exact that wherever ceremony was appropriate things should be done decently and in order.' But his short tenure of office is and will be most remembered in Canterbury for his astonishing capacity to make and keep friends, and to enlist their co-operation in common service.

His relationship with other people always had something intensely personal about it: such a thing as a professional relationship never existed with him: there were times when he was on duty and acted accordingly, but the staff and workmen of the cathedral and every variety of person in the city quickly came to realize that they had found a friend to whom they would turn, and one whose understanding led him to forge a personal link and see to it that their position and responsibilities earned their due recognition and appreciation.

But once again the attacks of asthma became more frequent, and he was forced before two years were over to resign. There followed another period of inactivity, during which he entered a new field. His contributions to a number of papers and journals showed his close touch with ordinary people and their problems. In spite of many who deprecated his entry into journalism, he remained convinced that he and others had a real part to play in bringing Christianity naturally into the everyday background of people's lives—as represented by the journals that they read—and that those who would win men to Christ need not hesitate to use (and possibly help to redeem) the weapons of this world.

To quote the Dean of St. Paul's again: 'For all his modernity and close contact with the contemporary world he was a primitive Christian. He had no use for a religion that does not transform the world and save human beings from misery. . . . A primitive Christian in the modern world must be to some extent an alien and a rebel. To his sensitive spirit the thought of cruelty and oppression in our civilization was a constant torture—and still more the dark goal towards which he feared it was tending.' This sensitiveness to the tragedy of the world was what led him eventually to pour all his energy into the Peace Campaign. He saw war as something in which no Christian could ever again bear a part, and all his powers of leadership and organization were devoted to the building up of the Peace Pledge Union.

Even those who most whole-heartedly disagreed with this policy could never suspect his motives or fail to respect him for living up to his convictions, even while they themselves felt that the world's salvation could not be brought about by such means.

It is no exaggeration to say that he laid down his life for this cause. His general health had not really improved, but a special form of atomizer had been found which gave him almost instantaneous relief in his worst attacks of asthma. But though the symptom was thus kept in check, the physical exhaustion and strained heart which were its cause had not been overcome, when there came to him the offer of a canonry at St. Paul's. He accepted the post with the greatest reluctance, and at any rate until the last few days of his life could not feel happy in an atmosphere which was in many of its aspects uncongenial to him. That he had not actually resigned was due to the personal affection he felt for the Dean. His official relationship with all connected with the work of the cathedral was, as it had been at Canterbury, transformed by his personal and intimate touch. But what should have been his times of rest and leisure between his periods of official residence were filled to the full with addressing meetings in all parts of England, attending committees, and welding together the efforts of those who were working for peace. As often as not his whole day was filled with meetings and interviews, and the night spent in travelling back to London for a full day's work, or to be ready to leave for some other distant place where he was to speak the following evening. It was a cause for which he was ready to sacrifice everything, and in the end it demanded of him the highest sacrifice of all. But a week before the end came he gained an honour that gave him very special happiness. He was elected by a large majority Lord Rector of Glasgow University—of which he had held an Honorary D.D. since 1927.

In the framework of that life of which the foregoing is but the barest sketch, Dick Sheppard constructed a masterpiece of living which will place his name among the greatest of those who have made of the Christian religion a thing of power and compelling attraction in their day. So much was he in the public eye that those who only knew of him second-hand could not easily detect his genuine simplicity and humility. He was completely unself-conscious where a cause greater than himself could be served: his moral courage was exceptional: his whole life was dominated by a passionate desire to serve his Lord and Master, and bring others to the knowledge of Him.

His friendship had a unique quality in that he seemed to give a part of himself to each of his friends and yet the part that he gave never appeared to be shared with any one else. An ever fresh sense of humour gave an added balance to all his outlook. A dreamer of dreams and a visionary, he yet had the surest of practical touches in dealing with the multifarious problems and responsibilities which he not only seemed to attract but to create. His insight into human hearts and motives led him to see through the pretensions and pretentiousness of many with whom he was brought into contact, yet he had the power when with them of doing much to win them back to that which it was in their power to become.

Such was his love, sympathy, and understanding—the outcome of a complete unselfishness and longing to serve—that it is not surprising that those who knew him longest and best, feeling how much he outdistanced them, have expressed their conviction that he was the most Christlike man they have ever known.

Freedom and Tradition in Religious Thought.

By Principal W. Robinson, M.A., B.Sc., D.D., Overdale College, Selly Oak, Birmingham.

Christianity did not begin as a system of speculative thought or as a reasoned theology. It began as a way of life based upon a faith. And faith was not assent to certain intellectual propositions enshrining a metaphysic about a reality or a cosmological phantasia. Faith, for the early Church, was trust in and loyalty to the Person of Christ; and dogma was not a given set of intellectual propositions to be believed on pain of death, but a set of given facts *which had happened in history*. These facts were regarded by early Christians as having a certain meaning and value for life and destiny. To put it simply, they were regarded as being, in an absolute sense, acts of God on the plane of history. The earliest compilation of these facts of which we have any record is that given by St. Paul, writing to the Corinthian Church about A.D. 53. He there assures the Corinthians that he delivered unto them, first of all, that which he received, evidently referring to the instruction which had been given him by the messenger of the Damascus Church before his baptism, nearly twenty years earlier. There is good ground for believing, with Ed. Meyer, that St. Paul is here quoting the baptismal creed of the Damascus Church.[1] These facts enumerated are:

1. Christ Jesus died for our sins, according to the Scriptures.
2. He was buried.
3. He rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures.
4. He was seen of Cephas.

Here, then, we have four given happenings in history; and faith, for the early Christians, meant reliance on these happenings *as the acts of God*—just as God had once created, so now He had come to redeem. From this followed the exaltation of Jesus as Lord and Christ and the beginning of Christian worship centring in two redemption rites, which were dramatic acts setting forth the Holy Action of God within the sphere of history. When we first meet the Christian Church, faith is a simple matter of trust in and loyalty to the manifestation of the character and action of God as set forth in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. This character of God can best be declared as *righteous love*—and both words are important.[2] The greatness of God had been shown to be, not power, but love. To the Jews it was a stumbling-block, to the Greeks foolishness, but to the Christians it was a sublime faith which had been guaranteed by an act which had about it the character of once-for-allness—the resurrection of Jesus Christ. And, in spite of every contradiction in life and thought, Christians were prepared to risk all and to venture on life and shape its course as if this were true. For them this faith was sealed by such simple affirmations as, 'I believe Jesus is Lord (*Maran*),' and 'I believe Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God,' which were oaths of allegiance, rather than dogmatic utterances in the sense in which we to-day generally understand dogma. In their worship, which was *action* rather than words, they constantly saw the Holy Action of God re-presented in symbolic forms. In Baptism they saw set forth the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus, and the personal action of God was again made intimate for them in the remission of sins. In the Breaking of the Bread they again saw Christ visibly depicted crucified, and His holy action was made meaningful and powerful in the Fellowship which shared His life and was willing to be identified with Him in making up the afflictions which were lacking—treading the path of love and not of power.

This is all very different from later forms of Christianity seen in the structure of classical Catholicism or of classical Protestantism, where dogma has become a set of given propositions, which are mainly *explanations* of given facts, set forth in closely reasoned terms, rather than the facts themselves; and where *faith* is conceived of subjectively as assent to the given propositions, and objectively as the sum-total of the propositions themselves. In both Catholicism and Protestantism of the classical types, theological definition is of more importance than the facts to be defined, and rational assent to propositions has taken the place of personal allegiance.[1]

---

[1] 1 Co 15^{3-5}. For justification of this idea, see *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, Bk. III. p. 209 ff.

[2] This is what St. Paul asserts in the classic passages in Ro 3^{25} and 5^{8}. Surely the sense of προέθετο as used here by St. Paul is that of a *visible* manifestation, as is the sense of προεγράφη as used in Gal 3^{1}, a passage which I believe refers to the Christian Eucharist. If this is so, the sense of Ro 3^{25} may be taken to be that in the life of Jesus, and more especially in the spectacle of the Cross, there was *placarded* once for all on the plane of history the fact that God *is* righteous, in spite of all the seeming contradictions of history. There the fact had been *floodlit*.

The contrast which I have drawn between the conceptions of faith and dogma in the early Church and in later classical Catholicism and Protestantism, makes it clear that in the one case there was, within the sphere of loyalty, much room for freedom of thought and liberty of interpretation; whereas in the other case such liberty has almost entirely disappeared. Instead we have developed the idea of salvation by orthodoxy. How did this change come about? It came about, in the first place, because Christianity, like any other way of life, is bound to explain itself in the thought-forms of the world in which it finds itself. And, in the second place, it came about because Christianity had to defend itself against systems of life and thought which inevitably would have perverted its central truth. Let us examine the process more closely.

In the history of Christianity there have been certain great periods when theological activity has been at a maximum, and other periods when there has been little or no such activity. These periods of theological activity may be set out as five in number:

1. The Creative Period, which begins with St. Paul and ends with St. Augustine.
2. The Scholastic Period, which may be said to have its beginning with the Revival of Learning in the tenth century and ends with St. Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth.
3. The Reformation Period, beginning in the early sixteenth century and going on into the seventeenth.
4. The Critical Period, beginning with Schleiermacher at the close of the eighteenth century and ending with Harnack in the early twentieth.
5. The Period of Confessionalism, which some people prefer to call The Period of Reaction, with prophets like P. T. Forsyth, Karl Barth, Emil Brunner, Otto Piper, Paul Tillich, Karl Heim, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Nicolas Berdyaev.

Let us look at each of these movements in turn.

I.

From the first of these great movements Christianity emerged with:

1. A definite hierarchical system centring in a single organ of authority—the General Council—through which the Great Church could speak dogmatically on points of doctrine, order, worship, and discipline. So far as the Eastern Church is concerned, however, the dogmatic utterance of a Council was never completely regarded as the voice of the Holy Spirit until it had received the *Consensus fidelium.* This is practically the position of the Eastern Orthodox Church to-day, though it is not generally understood by some of the auto-cephalous Churches, nor by many within all the Churches.[2]
2. A sacred Canon of Holy Scripture, identical—at least in the West—with our present Canon, which Canon was accepted as a norm by which to test all development in doctrine and practice.
3. Certain doctrines clearly defined, and safeguarded in most cases by a Creed which had œcumenical authority (the present form of the Nicene Creed). These doctrines included:
    - (*a*) The doctrine of the Person of Christ which was set forth as two natures in one Person.
    - (*b*) The doctrine of God, which was set forth as one of trine-unity—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, One God.
    - (*c*) The doctrine of Grace, which declared the inability of man to save himself, and was set forth in terms of predestination.
    - (*d*) The doctrine of the Church, which declared its visible unity as the organ of Christ's will and the sole sphere of salvation.

---

[1] This can hardly be asserted of the creeds which played their part in defining dogma in the Conciliar period of Church history, such as The Apostles' Creed in its various forms), the original Nicene Creed, The Creed of Constantinople, The Creed of Eusebius, The Creed of Chalcedon. Here, in the main, dogma is still concerned with facts rather than the explanation of facts, though perhaps the personal aspect of faith has been largely lost sight of.

[2] See a recent memorandum submitted by Father Sergius Boulgakoff to the Metropolitan Eulogias in refutation of a heresy charge. In this Memorandum he sets forth the Orthodox doctrine of the *Consensus fidelium.*

(*e*) The doctrine of Revelation, which declared the given-ness of God's will in the sacred Scriptures. By this time the doctrine of Revelation had hardened into that of Verbal Inspiration—an inheritance which the early Christian Church had received from Jewish Scholastic Theology.

4. The two great sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist, as dramatic vehicles for representing the central facts of the Christian Faith and as channels of grace.

As yet there had been no attempt to define what later became a great centre of controversy—the doctrine of the Atonement.

Throughout the whole of this period there had been much freedom of thought, much controversy (which naturally goes along with freedom of thought), and much variety of emphasis, especially in the East where intellectual activity had precedence over the desire for order and uniformity of a legal and disciplined type, which was the passion of Rome and of the West generally. Though dogma was not yet set forth in completely legal and authoritarian terms, nevertheless the passion of Rome for disciplined order had so far triumphed, and from now until the Revival of Learning there was little theological activity of any consequence. What followed was a great period of missionary activity and dogmatic evangelism with undisciplined growth of devotional practices.

II.

The Scholastic Theology[1] had its occasion in the Revival of Learning and the consequent necessity of expressing the Christian message in the new thought-forms of Aristotelian philosophy. The Church of the West was still one, but within this Church there were the two great rival schools of Dominicans and Franciscans. It should always be remembered that the Western Catholic Church was nothing like so intransigent as the modern Roman Church. Theological opinions varied as between one school and another, and the great Doctors of the Church were in their own day 'modernists,' as they always are in days of theological controversy—that is, they were attempting to express their Christian faith in the thought-forms of the modern world in which they lived, and refusing to adhere to out-worn shibboleths of a bygone age. They all, each in their turn, claimed liberty of expression against the traditional thought-forms of dogmatic decrees which they saw to be no longer serviceable. This was especially true of the greatest of them all—St. Thomas Aquinas, who set forth his teaching in the great *Summa*, which has ever since remained definitive for the Roman Church.

The passion of Aristotelian thought is for logical precision, and, broadly speaking, we may say that during this period doctrine became more logically formulated on the basis of the underlying idea that the relationship between God and the universe, including the kingdom of men, is one of a *legal* character. Theology became completely transactional, and this transactional character of doctrine has remained very permanent in Western Theology, both Catholic and Protestant. The wholly *personal* relationship of God to men was almost entirely lost sight of. Dogma (in the modern sense of the term) thus became of major importance, and its character was that of *supernaturally given truth*. The natural and the supernatural became sharply divided. Man by his natural reason (and the whole emphasis was on reason) was able to arrive at belief in God and in immortality, but could not have arrived at the dogmas of the Trinity and the Incarnation. These were rational concepts which had to be supernaturally delivered, and could only be rejected on pain of death. No *natural* truth could be allowed to contradict what had been supernaturally delivered. By this time, too, the doctrine of Grace, in accordance with legal modes of thought, had assumed the form of a credit and debit balance system, and a whole Moral Theology with its system of casuistry was added to doctrinal theology proper. The sacrament of Penance was thoroughly elaborated and became the major sacrament of the Church. It was at this point, and almost at this point alone, that Protestantism in its classical form of Lutheranism broke with the Roman Church.

In any judgment we pass on Mediæval Christianity it must always be remembered that the Mediæval Church was entirely unlike the Primitive Church in one important respect. The Primitive Church came into a world which was highly civilized and cultured. It had nothing to contribute to the ancient world in the realm of culture—art, music, politics, and so on. It existed as one of many societies within the State, often displaying the puritan attitude of complete separation from the State. The Mediæval Church, on the other hand, was the sole guardian of the relics of the culture of the ancient world. It was a missionary Church, and its missionaries came to the barbaric cultures of northern Europe with a tradition which was ripe in wisdom and powerful in discipline. The Church was the arbiter of the State's destiny, and the whole of life and culture were within her domain. The instrument of excommunication was the most powerful social and political force which the world has ever known. The world was adolescent and the Church was the nursing-mother[1] and more often the stern father. The intransigence of the Mediæval Church becomes most pronounced and evident in the field of authoritarian disciplinary action after the time of Aquinas, and heresy-hunting and martyrdom began to be common in the fourteenth century. The notion of salvation by orthodoxy had become supreme.

---

[1] The great movements in the field of speculative theology, except the first, have reference to Western Christianity only. Orthodoxy was scarcely influenced at all by Scholastic Theology; it was only slightly influenced by Reformed Theology; and it is only now coming in contact with the theology of the Critical Period and making its own peculiar response, while at the same time it is producing, especially in the exiled Russian Church, its own Theology of Crisis.

III.

The Reformation theologies were occasioned, in the first place, by the new world which was produced by the revolutionary thought of the astronomers, explorers, and scientists. In the second place, it was occasioned by the corrupt state of the Roman Church which became plainly evident to a world no longer adolescent. In the third place, it was occasioned by the growth of nationalism, which was not a result of the Reformation but one of its causes.

The classical Reformation Theologies of Luther and Calvin differed little from the Mediæval Scholastic Theology, and this is even more true of the second generation of Lutherans and Calvinists. That of Zwingli differed in a more fundamental way. But one thing the Reformers had to do, and that was to break with the authority of the Church and so to give a new emphasis to the doctrine of private judgment. But once their systems were set up, private judgment was another matter. How far they were prepared to go with it is seen in Luther's treatment of the Anabaptists and Calvin's burning of Servetus, as well as in the Anglican persecutions of Roman Catholic and Separatist disturbers of the national peace. Another thing which all the Reformers did was to break with the Roman system of moral theology which had become dreadfully corrupt. In its place they erected the doctrines of *sola fides* and *sola gratia*, which were equally capable of moral corruption. Another result of the Reformation was a fresh emphasis on Holy Scripture as the organ of authority, and the translation of the Scriptures into the vernacular gave a fresh impetus to their study, which at first resulted in a certain measure of free treatment but which later actually gave rise to a new literalism. And a final thing which the Reformation did was to make Rome more intransigent. Definition of doctrine was increased and liberty of interpretation reduced. Christianity was henceforth divided into camps set over against each other. Each camp had to build up its walls of defence and to build them as high as possible. These walls were the great Confessions of Faith which were produced in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, such as The Tridentine Decrees (Rome), The Helvetic and Westminster Confessions (Reformed), The Augsburg Confession and the Smalcald Articles (Lutheran), The Thirty-Nine Articles (Anglican), and The Racovian Catechism (Socinian).

These all became standards of orthodoxy, and they differ entirely from the creeds of the Primitive Church in that dogma is no longer a set of given *facts*, but a set of given *opinions*, closely defined and logically coherent. In the main this system of doctrine remained authoritative until the close of the eighteenth century. Meantime, the new scientific age was producing its results, and in the realms of astronomy and physics changing the whole current of men's thought. The Churches were becoming more and more isolated from the main currents of life, and theology more and more remote from the ways of men's thought.

IV.

The eighteenth century saw a great religious revival with emphasis on feeling and experience as over against reason and rational theology. Nevertheless the old dogmatic truths were the basis of the new experience as they remained the basis of nineteenth-century evangelicalism. But this new emphasis on experience gave rise to a new experiential theology in the work of Schleiermacher, and opened the way for a new critical inquiry. The scientific spirit had once more entered the field of theology and Biblical interpretation. The chief result of this new movement was to subject the

---

[1] Perhaps, as in the case of many nursing-mothers, the Church became the possessive-mother and refused to allow her children to grow up, with the inevitable result that some failed to grow up and remained the children of authority, whilst others rebelled and sought freedom and manhood away from her bosom.

Bible to an exhaustive critical inquiry, and to subject religion to both historical and psychological inquiry. The actual results may be summed up as follows:

1. The Bible came to be understood as a record of *progressive revelation* or *progressive discovery* in the field of religion. Eventually, in the extreme schools, discovery and revelation were regarded as one and the same thing.
2. The old literalism was broken down, and *historical* interpretation of the Bible was substituted for *textual* interpretation.
3. The Jesus of history assumed a new importance, and was rediscovered in a somewhat preferential and arbitrary treatment of the Synoptic Gospels which resulted in two sharply contrasted pictures, the Ethical Jesus and the Apocalyptic Jesus.
4. Jesus was sharply divided from St. Paul, who came to be regarded as the first perverter of the original Ethical Gospel of the Kingdom of God which was conceived of purely as a Kingdom of Social Righteousness. Paul had mistakenly deified Jesus, who had been the last and greatest of the ethical prophets whom Judaism had produced.
5. Religion came to be equated with the History of Religion and interpreted through the Psychology of Religion, and theology came to be regarded as a by-product of social forces.[1]
6. A new emphasis on *life* as over against *creed* became widespread, and moralism was substituted for religious dependence.
7. The Church and the Sacraments tended to become quite secondary and in the end almost irrelevant for Christian theology.
8. Finally the emphasis in religion became almost wholly subjective, with the result that toleration developed into 'anythingarianism.'

The above are broad generalisations, and there are many things which here must remain unsaid. But, whatever the results, theology had to pass through this stage and to be released from some of its old dogmatic manacles, in order that it might not only understand itself in the light of the new knowledge of the world which the scientific age had produced, but also in order that it might arrive at a deeper understanding of the Faith in Christ which it sought to interpret. One thing this new movement did which was of permanent value—it put out of court for ever the old Biblical literalism and the *legal* interpretation of Christian doctrine.[2]

V.

The last of the great movements in Theology (and we must speak with great caution about it, for it is a movement which is now in process) may be described as a movement away from liberalism towards orthodoxy, but orthodoxy at a deeper level; and away from easy-going tolerance towards confessionalism, but confessionalism in the form of *essential witness* and *fundamental principles.* It is an attempt to lead away from all subjectivisms to what is objective. The transcendence of God is once again being emphasized over against immanence, and the Psychology of Religion and the History of Religion are no longer the arbiters of the Christian Faith. Philosophy and science have their place, but they are no longer the creators of the *credo.* And so far as philosophy and science are concerned we have to note that within their field there has been a most significant move away from materialism and mechanism towards a spiritual interpretation of the universe, so that the conflict between religion and science, in the sense in which it was understood in the nineteenth century, is almost a meaningless concept.

This last movement in the field of theology is the most complex of all, and there are many varying elements within it, so that it is difficult to describe. But we may say some things:

1. The new critical interpretation of the Bible is its basis and remains regulative. This position is accepted by all to-day except Roman Catholics (I mean officially) and extreme Evangelicals (Fundamentalists) who inhabit all the Protestant Churches and wholly embrace some of the smaller bodies.
2. The Word of God, which has received a new

---

[1] Many exponents of this school failed to see that their own theology was equally condemned as a by-product of their own social environment. Others frankly recognized it and abandoned theology for religious humanism.

[2] There was a parallel movement in America to that inaugurated in Europe by Schleiermacher and Ritschl. It had for its prophets men like Moses Stuart of Andover and, later, Alexander Campbell of Bethany, Va. Campbell, who was a Lockian in philosophy, reacted violently against literalism and legalism; see his *Sermon on the Law*, delivered in 1816. Campbell had a large following, but unfortunately the second generation of his followers understood little of his aims and purposes.

emphasis, is not so much a *spoken* word as an *acted* word. What is important for theology is the Holy Action of God revealing to us His character and purpose.

3. This, of course, means that Revelation is never infallible in the sense in which it has been conceived to be in traditional Catholic and Protestant theologies, though it is infallible in a deeper sense. Man's search for an infallibility of the rigid, verbal, and legal type is a vain one. An infallible declaration of this kind would need an infallible mind to understand and interpret it. But an infallible mind is just the kind of mind which would have no need for such a declaration. The whole thing is a delusion and ought to worry us no longer. Both Judaism and Christianity are agreed that *in the absolute* God's ways are past finding out, but they both rely fully on the guidance of God in history, that is on Revelation. Theories of 'infallibility without limits' belong to those systems which are of the order of 'flights away from reality,' and both Judaism and Christianity are far too closely wedded to history—to what is actual—to find room for such theories. It is true that both Jewish and Christian Scholastic systems have propounded theories of 'infallibility without limits,' but such theories are really alien to the temper of both religions; and, paradoxically enough, they have been found to carry with them nothing but 'limits'—they have been the means of binding and not of loosing. When we realize that Revelation is divinely contrived but humanly conditioned, that we need training which will make us sensitive to values, that our limits set a limit on God in the sense of the measure in which He may be fulfilled in us, we do not rob ourselves of the idea of infallibility, but we arrive at a notion of infallibility as existential and concrete. This, if we like to call it so, may be described as 'infallibility with limits,' and it is just this kind of infallibility, which, paradoxically enough, carries with it no limits. And just for this reason it can never be completely conveyed in *verbal* form. At its highest it has for its vehicle the Divine Act. The words of the younger Isaac Penington are to the point here: 'All truth is a shadow except the last. But every truth is substance in its own place, though it be but a shadow in another place. And the shadow is a true shadow, as the substance is a true substance.'[1]
4. There is a return to the primitive emphasis on dogmas as *given facts in history*, and on faith as *fiducia* and not *assensus*—a venturing out on life on the ground of certain deathless and uncontradictable actions of God within the sphere and meaning of history. This is coupled with the revival of the idea of the 'fulfilled time' or the 'ripe time' in history. The 'eternal now' of God is given in the 'crises' of history.
5. There is a new emphasis on the Church as an ontological reality, and as having meaning for history. The Church is closely identified with 'the true Israel,' 'the Remnant,' or 'the Little Flock,' which in history represents the level at which the heavenly and earthly planes intersect and at which 'over history' is shot down into history. With this emphasis on the Church goes a revived emphasis on the Sacraments and a new interest in worship which is concerned rather with its objective quality than with its subjective apparatus.
6. In many of the schools[2] within the movement there is a welcome emphasis on the *personal* action of God as over against *legal* and *mechanical* action. This is perhaps the deepest thing of all, and it means that God's Holy Action in creation and redemption is nothing other than God's bid for *fellowship*; so that the whole problem of freedom and authority takes on a new complexion as it is seen to be related to loyalty within

---

[1] Early in the third century Origen, through his study of the Fourth Gospel, had become aware of the need for a similar philosophy of Revelation in history. He declares that it was the purpose of the Evangelists 'to give truth where possible, both spiritually and corporeally, but when this was not possible, to prefer the spiritual to the corporeal, the true spiritual meaning being often preserved, so to speak, in the corporeal falsehood' (*Commentary on St. John's Gospel*, x. 4).

[2] It is a pity that this new movement in theology has come to be known almost solely in the form of Barthianism. Many people do not know that even in Germany Barth is only *one* amongst a number of leaders, such as Heim, Piper, and Tillich, and still less do they understand that the movement has its prophets elsewhere, such as Berdyaev in Orthodoxy, and the new Realistic theologians in America, and that von Hügel and P. T. Forsyth are just as significant as Karl Barth and much less hysterical and pathological.

a fellowship of love, and not to logic within a system of law.

So far as freedom and tradition in Christian thought are concerned, perhaps the one most important lesson we may learn from all this is that we shall never learn to set ourselves right within this whole business of freedom and tradition until, on the one hand, we set aside the whole paraphernalia of *legal* ideas which have worked such havoc in Christian theology, and until, on the other hand, we learn the meaning of *loyalty* based on a love relationship. Then we shall discover that only within loyalty is freedom, that he is most free who is most loyal, for loyalty is freedom, and freedom means loyalty. We must learn to grow up and to be true sons and not slaves, nor even sons-in-law, in our Father's house.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Bridge-makers.

By the Reverend Ralph F. Calder, B.A., B.D., Glasgow.

Have you ever thought how really important bridges are? Perhaps you live in a city which is built on both sides of a river—then you will realize how long a time we should take if we had to wade or swim or take a boat or go along the bank until we could jump over the narrow stream near its source. And how dangerous it would be if every time a road and a railway line met, it could only be at a level crossing, and how tiresome having to wait for the gates to open! Bridges are most valuable things. They make for speed and comfort and safety, but most important they make for friendship, for they bring us closer together and so help us to know and understand each other.

Most of the bridges you will have seen will have been made of stone or steel or concrete or wood. But I want to tell you the strangest story of a bridge which was built on eggs.

Very nearly five hundred years ago there came to the throne of Bohemia, in the middle of Europe, a king called Charles the Fourth. He had a fine castle built on one bank of the river Vltava, separated from his capital city Prague by the strong flowing waters. If any one wished to go from the town to the palace, or the palace to the town, he had to use the ferry boat, and in winter-time the river ran so swiftly that the boat was sometimes swept away. So King Charles gave orders for a bridge to be built. Great stones were gathered together, and at last the work was finished. But the bridge stood up for a few months only, for the first flood waters from the hills swept it away. A second bridge was ordered and built, but it suffered the same fate, as did a third. The King was much distressed and wondered what to do. Then he had a bright idea. He issued a proclamation, commanding each of his subjects to bring to the riverside a basketful of eggs. This was done, and great piles of eggs were stacked up by the wondering men and women of Bohemia. Then the workmen were told to break up the eggs and mix into the sticky mess sand and gravel. If you have ever broken an egg in your hand you will have some idea of what a gluey mixture this would be. The result was embedded in the river and became the foundation of another bridge. The floods came that year, and have done ever since, but the bridge still stands after nearly five hundred years, one of of the most beautiful, yet solidly built bridges in Europe.

A bridge built upon eggs! Little, frail common things, yet together linking two sides of a river that the people might cross over and understand and love each other.

Would you think me rude if I said that the story makes me think of you children? You are only small things in the great world of people. Yet you have built many mighty bridges together, and could build more. Are not the Boy Scouts and the Girl Guides and the Boys' Brigade like great bridges built between countries making for friendship and love between peoples?—and these are made up of tiny little contributions, like some of you here today. So are the world's Sunday schools, when the children think and pray about one another in different lands.

You would notice that I have no text—that is because the word bridge does not occur in the Bible, for there were no bridges in Palestine. But I think that if Jesus had heard our story He would have thought of you, and of how you could help towards the peace of the world by forming a bridge for understanding and love. We are to sing the hymn, ‘Oh what can little hands do to please the King of heaven?' What about trying to be a bridge-maker?

Names and Nicknames.

By the Reverend C. M. Hepburn, B.D., Moulin, Pitlochry.

'What is thy name?'—Mk 5[9].

Our Lord once asked a man that question. And the poor tormented creature replied, 'My name is Legion: for we are many.' It was a queer, but rather a fitting name, a name with a meaning. In the Bible there are many such. In general, Jewish parents did not select for their boys and girls just any sort of name, but as a rule tried to choose one that would be appropriate. Samson, you know, was a mighty man, but do you know that Samson means 'a strong man' too? Hannah, again, called her boy Samuel, that is, 'heard of God,' for God had heard and answered her prayer.

It was customary also among the Puritans to add special names to their own names afterwards, to describe their character. A list is given in an old book of some Puritans who lived in Sussex. All the names they chose contained Bible ideas, such as:

Fight-the-good-fight-of-faith White,
Weep-not Billing,
Peace-of-God Knight,
Kill-Sin Pemble,
Stand-Fast Stringer,
More-Fruit Fowler.

I'm afraid that last one is rather like a greengrocer's advertisement, but the real meaning is not 'eat' more fruit, but 'bear' more fruit.

But even to-day some people take new names with a meaning. Particularly so when heathen people have become Christian. One of David Livingstone's loyal servants when he became Christian chose as his name Matthew Wellington, and he was as noble as his name; while recently a Chinese on turning Christian took the splendid name Wung-Chih-Wu, which, it appears, means 'determined to serve.'

Sometimes, again, people are given what we call nicknames. All nicknames are not bad ones. Sometimes a nickname can be a real compliment. A delightful old lady, who is ninety-one years of age, came to live in my parish lately, and I had the privilege of paying her a visit. She told me in a rich Scotch accent of the days when she was young. 'Ah,' she said, with a twinkle in her eye, 'in those days they used to call me Soople Hocky!' She had been so supple on her feet. But I also know that these same feet had been 'swift and beautiful' for the King, and ever ready to go on His business. And here is another such name I heard of. A tombstone in a Lancashire village has this line upon it: 'Honest Adam Screed, Wheelwright.' It described both his work and his character. It was a name and a reputation well worth having. Honest Adam. And may I mention still one more. During my schooldays I often met an old blind woman. She was poor as well as blind. But she never seemed to give in to her troubles, and she usually had a laugh on her lips. She was always spoken of as 'Smiley Mary.' And when I think of it, that was a nickname she well deserved. Her real name, as a matter of fact, was Mary Hope, and that suited her too.

And now I wonder whether you've got a nickname, or what sort of one you would deserve? At any rate make up your mind that your conduct is going to be such that, if you are given one at all, it will be a good one. I can tell you of one that you could get. It is mentioned in a beautiful poem by William Blake:

'I have no name:
I am but two days old.'
What shall I call thee?
'I happy am,
Joy is my name.'
Sweet joy befall thee!

And whether you are young or old you can win that name if you come to Jesus, for by doing His will and going His way, joy will be both your name and your nature.

If I come to Jesus,
He will make me glad;
He will give me pleasure
When my heart is sad.

If I come to Jesus,
Happy shall I be;
He is gently calling
Little ones like me.

The Christian Year.

Second Sunday after Epiphany.

The Magnetism of the Unseen.

'Whom having not seen, ye love; in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory: receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls.'—1 P 1[8. 9].

I fancy that many a Christian, encountering these words of Peter's—'whom having not seen'—would answer at once, 'But I *have* seen Him! You can't shake my certainty of that. It is the very foundation of my personal religion, that Christ and I have met.' I think many of us would say that. And quite rightly. For if the unspoken demand that the Christian preacher hears from a congregation gathering in the Church for worship, is, 'Sir, we would see Jesus'; if he realizes that he has been ordained to his ministry, not to waste his time and theirs on genial generalities, but to do something to meet that demand for the vision of the Son of God—then it must be possible to see Christ still.

And yet—'whom having not seen,' says Peter. For, after all, none of us has seen Christ just as Peter saw Him. To Peter, as to the other disciples, Jesus had been a physical presence. I am sure the thought sometimes comes to us—'If I could have lived with Him as they did, could have consulted Him about the personal difficulties that make a tangle of my life, how much simpler life would have been!'

Dim tracts of time divide
Those golden days from me;
Thy voice comes strange o'er years of change;
How can we follow Thee?

Comes faint and far Thy voice
From vales of Galilee;
Thy vision fades in ancient shades;
How should we follow Thee?

But natural as such thoughts may be, they are really quite mistaken. One fact they are ignoring, the fact Paul fixed on when he said, 'Christ, being raised from the dead, dieth no more'; which means that what Calvary and the Resurrection did was to set the Spirit of Jesus loose in the world, untrammelled and alive for ever, freer actually than He ever was in the days of Galilee, and nearer now to His own than when they roamed together through the cornfields and the vineyards, or kept vigil beneath the Syrian stars.

And so we turn to the main burden of the Apostle's message. What he is trying to do here is something rather daring: it is nothing less than to define the central Christian experience in a single sentence; and you will observe that he has packed it all into four words, four short, decisive verbs: 'Ye love—ye believe—ye rejoice—ye receive.' That, he declares, is what it means to be a Christian. That, throughout the ages, has been the high road of salvation.

Let us examine this fourfold progression. First stands the verb '*Ye love.*' Now that immediately suggests the question—What, in its essence, *is* the Christian religion?

Not a philosophy of life. Certainly it will give you a philosophy, for the faith of Jesus is ultimately the only thing that can make sense of the universe. But that is not what its essence is. You need more than a philosophy to hold you steady when the storms begin to blow, or when your dreams are lying wrecked, or when the demons of temptation have leapt upon your soul.

Not a moral code. Certainly it will provide you with that—the most sublime and noble ethic in the world. But that is not its essence. Men are not set on fire for God by anything so intolerably distant and impersonal as moral maxims and ethical idealisms.

Not a social creed. Certainly it will give you that: Christ has been behind more social reforms than any other leader who has ever appeared upon the earth. But that is not its essence. No amount of merely social passion can change lives or work the miracle of regeneration; and you cannot build the Kingdom of heaven out of men and women not redeemed.

The essence of Christ's religion is none of these things. It is a personal attachment. It is a response in love to the most fascinating Personality who ever walked this earth.

How can I choose but love Thee, God's dear Son,
O Jesus, loveliest and most loving One?
Were there no heaven to gain, no hell to flee,
For what Thou art alone, I must love Thee.

Then the Apostle proceeds: 'In whom though now ye see him not, yet believing.' There is his second verb. Ye love, and—*ye believe.* Now it is this that keeps the love in Christianity from growing sentimental. For what is belief in Christ? What, for that matter, is belief in any one? It is *love going into action.* It is love staking its soul upon the worth of the one beloved. Kagawa of Japan was trying to explain what Christianity meant to him. 'I am God's gambler,' he cried. 'For Him I have wagered my last mite.' That is belief—not intellectual assent to a theory, but the throwing in of a life. In the stirring words of Martin Luther: 'The only faith which makes a Christian is that which casts itself on God for life or death.'

It is easy to see that, apart from this, love might degenerate into sentimentalism. There is a type of religion which sings, with suitable emotion, the love songs of the Church, without ever so much as giving a thought to what an old saint once called 'the stormy north side of Jesus Christ.'

To worship Christ, without bringing life into line with such worship, is definitely more dangerous for a man's own soul than if he never worshipped at all. But the mark of Christian faith, says Peter, is not that it uses glowing love-language about Jesus: it is that it surrenders its life to the object of its love. Faith means being permeated with Christ's spirit. It means being captured by Christ's character. It means, as it meant to Christ, that you risk doing the will of God, even when there is a cross in it. Nothing sentimental about that love! It is strong with the strength of the eternal hills, and beautiful with the terrible beauty that once flamed up to God on Calvary.

Follow the Apostle's progress further. Ye love, ye believe, '*ye rejoice* with joy unspeakable and full of glory.' Do you trace the connection? You love Jesus—that is first; and that love leads on to an offering of your life to Jesus—to belief and faith and irrevocable surrender; and that offering of life in turn produces a new kind of thrill never known before. For here is the great discovery you make: there is no joy on earth like the joy of being committed.

It is the swithering and undecided attitude that is dull and dreary and never sings. You cannot be happy—it is a psychological and spiritual impossibility—as long as you are refusing the daring of your own soul.

And if we could show the world to-day that being committed to Christ is no tame, humdrum, sheltered monotony, but the most fascinating and exciting adventure the human spirit can ever know—'joy unspeakable and full of glory'—then thousands of strong and stalwart lives that have been holding back from Christ and looking askance at the Church and standing outside the Kingdom would come crowding in to His allegiance; and there might be such a revival as the world has not witnessed since Pentecost.

This is no empty dream. There are signs now that the age is ripe for a great return to Christ. What are we witnessing throughout Europe and the world to-day? We are witnessing a demand for two things—a leader, and a cause. A living leader—not any longer a political theory or a revolutionary idea, but the theory incarnate in a man, the idea crystallized in a person, the word made flesh—that is what men are wanting: hence the hero-worship offered to-day to a Stalin, a Gandhi, a Hitler. And along with that, men demand a cause, something which will lay the most absolute claims upon them, something to which they can commit themselves sacrificially, body, mind, and soul. Nationalism and Communism may be at each other's throats, and their conflict productive of chaos in the world; but at least they are alike in this, that each claims unhesitatingly a man's all, everything he has to give. That is what the spirit of the age is clamouring for—the leader who will readily lead, the cause that will challenge to sacrifice. And therefore, is not this the day of Christ's opportunity? It is high time we realized that it is no use setting a mild and undemanding half-Christianity against a militant, masterful paganism; no use setting some poor apologetic replica of Christ against the deified heroes of the age.

And now we take the last step with the Apostle. Ye love, ye believe, ye rejoice, '*ye receive* the salvation of your souls.' The word 'salvation' is like the Cross that purchased it: it reaches up to heaven, and goes down to hell, and its arms embrace the world. For the past, it brings forgiveness; for the present, the power of the Spirit; and for the future, life for evermore.

And, says Peter, ye receive it. You do not win it, for no man can do that. You do not earn it, for it is not a wage. You do not buy it, for it is not for sale. You receive it. You bow your head, with pride all broken down, and take the gift from Jesus' hand.[1]

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

Triumph of Righteousness: An Address to Boys.

'Follow me.'—Lk 9⁵⁹.

If ever there were a defeatist slogan, surely it was this one. Admitted that Jesus was only at the outset of His ministry; admitted that His cry was backed up by all the power and influence of a young idealist, whose character was wonderful and magnificent and unique: none the less, one moment's thought would suffice to show its utter madness. The battle-cry was uttered by a village workman in an insignificant, remote, subjugated Roman province. It challenged every system of law in the world—the political law, the religious law, the moral law. It had no men of might on its side. He who uttered it was an unknown carpenter. They who heard it were men and women of the humblest working-class type—boatmen, ploughmen, peasants, shepherds, housewives, profligates, and prostitutes. If they responded to the call *en masse*, doubled the number so gained, trebled them, quadrupled them—a single Roman cohort would have sufficed to disperse them utterly and hopelessly.

The battle-cry of faith has always been raised by, or in the presence of, an apparently impotent minority. What men believe is so often what their parents, their class, their nation believe. It is only a tiny number in each age who, venturing out upon the raft of a personal faith, have found in their faith their life, and cried: 'I live—yet not I, Christ liveth in me.'

---

[1] J. S. Stewart, *The Gates of New Life*, 123.

It is remarkable how we worship size in Nature and politics and religion. Yet size has never been the really influential element in human life. Was it not Mr. Einstein who said not very long ago that if two per cent. only of the people would declare themselves firmly against war in any shape or form, war would cease? And he is right: for it is the minorities which always win. They won in the matter of freedom of worship, of freedom of the slaves, of personal liberty, of the rights of man, of children in the chimneys, in the factories, in the mines. One of the greatest teachings of history is: distrust mass opinion; turn to the few who are standing out against it.

The story of mankind is full of amazing examples of this truth. What made a Grenfell, a Schweitzer, a Livingstone, a Wilberforce, a Thring, a Paton, but that? All of them were prepared to live a good ordinary life full of zest and pleasure. But they heard the call: 'Follow me and I will make you'—and what did He not make them? They had their zest and their pleasure; but their life, because not given to self-pleasing, was not ordinary; it had that extraordinary quality which comes to men whose lives have ceased to be ego-centric and have become Christo-centric.

So when in your future occupations you find wire-pulling and palm-greasing, wangling and scrounging, do not make the mistake that such methods can ever succeed. Because the majority rules to-day is the last possible reason why it should rule always. If you wish to be progressive, you will have to start your progress in a minority of one somewhere—no truth in life is more assured than that. Apply the magnet of truth to any age, any era, any civilization; you will find that the hope of that age is in its intelligent, thinking, active minorities.

The scholarship of Montesquieu's *Considerations on the Grandeur and the Decadence of the Romans* has long been left far behind; but the luminous, broad, deliberate consideration of the causes why Rome, which had been so mighty, fell so utterly, is as valuable to-day as it ever was. And the great Frenchman comes step by step and slowly to his conclusion that Rome smashed because of her inconsiderate and thoughtless acceptance of the majorities principle; she produced opulent patricians, but she did not produce the kind of individual citizen who could bring fresh thought and life to the Empire.

To-day there is another great empire of which we are members—the great British commonwealth of nations. And to each of us do the words spoken by one of our poets laureate come with significance:

> You, you, if you shall fail to understand
>   What England is, and what her all in all,
> On you will come the curse of all the land
>   Should this old England fall.

But England will not fall so long as it breeds citizens who bring thought and creative life to its assistance. Let us speak of one of them.

Just over one hundred years ago there was born an Englishman, Hudson Taylor, whose greatest saying was that God's work contained three stages: (1) Impossible! (2) Difficult! (3) Done! Hudson Taylor started the China Inland Mission in 1865, 'to plant the standard of the Cross in the eleven provinces of China not yet occupied, and in Chinese Tartary.' Amid incredible difficulties that mission slowly grew. To-day the mission he began has 1300 missionaries at work in practically every province, all in unknown places in China, and over five million pounds has been spent by it without one single appeal for funds. 'You must be conscious of the wonderful way God has prospered you in the C.I.M.', some one remarked to Taylor one day. 'I do not look at it that way,' was his answer. 'I sometimes think that God must have been looking for some one small enough and weak enough for Him to use, so that all the glory might be His, and that He found me.'

'Whose faith follow.' Whenever we hear that call we move across from the crowd, the herd, the main mass of men, into the sacrificial minority which sees a better world and decides it can do no other than create some portion of it.

Following the Teacher of Galilee, a man finds a new power and a new glory in all he does. Faced with a big job, an impossible job, he finds the impossible changes into the difficult, and the difficult into the done, the accomplished, the finished work for which his life was intended and fore-ordained. To his own amazement, as much as that of all who know him, he exults: 'I, muddle-headed, blundering I, am more than conqueror over this riddle of existence through Him that hath loved me.'

> Stand then in His great might,
>   With all His strength endued;
> But take, to arm you for the fight,
>   The panoply of God;

That, having all things done,
And all your conflicts passed,
Ye may o'ercome through Christ alone,
And stand entire at last.[1]

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

Fearfulness.

'I will hear what God the Lord will speak.'—Ps 85^8.

On nearly every subject affecting our duty or our happiness we are mightily confused.

Consider the sources of this confusion. For one, there is what seems to us to be an almost unbridgeable gulf between the splendour and the baseness of men and women like ourselves. If we pick up any newspaper the proof stares us in the eyes. In one column one reads of four old gentlemen in Japan done to death by hooligans dressed in uniform. In the next, a train fireman, blinded, gasping, crazed with pain, stumbles through scalding steam to reach the controls and brakes, reaches them and pulls, and delivers a hundred lives. And, as we read, the page is bright with glory. In another a poor tramp leaps into a raging flood after a baby girl, and brings her to land. But, in the magnificent sentence of the evangelist, 'himself he cannot save.' Underneath and in the same column a mother drowns her child. The insurance was worth £10. So that the cry that breaks from our lips is the tortured cry of Nicodemus, 'How can these things be?' How does it come about that the tiger and the ape inhabit one body and the hero and the saint another? How do they both inhabit the same body? How can the school and the church and the newspaper and Parliament manufacture heroes and saints? How and by what magic can they slay the animal that lurks in us? Or can we be lifted into a higher life of self-reverence and self-control only by a higher power? The moment a man sets himself these problems, he is as desolate as any sailor lost without helm and compass upon a waste of sea. Or the injustices that are all about us confuse our thought. Or the divided aims we find struggling for victory within ourselves. Or, most mysterious of all, the seeming inactivity of God. Why doesn't He send some consuming flame into the hearts of the nations and burn us clean of our hatred and stupidities and reliance on force: burn and burn and burn till these are in ashes for ever?

'God does nothing,' Carlyle muttered, and turned to the wall and died. And in her biography of Lord Salisbury, his daughter tells that, for the same reason, her father's soul was fast bound in misery and iron. 'God is all-loving,' he cried, 'and all-powerful. And the world is as it is. How are you going to explain that?' Explain, indeed! Why, if we are honest and have any stuff of courage in our conscience, we say out at once that we cannot explain it, and that a modern singer puts our case exactly:

It darkens. I have lost the ford,
The rocks have evil faces, Lord,
And I am awfully afraid.

The result? The result is that we are bewildered and miserable. Our mind keeps losing its way. We flounder along among the bogs of doubt and guesses. Or worse. We grope through a night in which the stars of hope and faith are black and out.

Is there anything fairer than a June morning? Or sweeter than a child's smile? Or more purifying than a true love? There is. And it is this. The discovery that we may be quit of our amazements and darkness and agony of thought for ever. And this when by God's kindness we are made to see that our confusions are of our own making. It is our fault. It is not God's. So far from wishing that we should be the slaves of fear, it is the aim and passion of God's love and Christ's mind that we should be kings and queens in spirit; that we should talk and work in the light; that we should breathe the bracing air of His truth; that we should feel His very Self in us, armour and cordial both; that we should remain simple and pure and glad and free, however busy and crowded the hour; and that the life-force that is in His Son's spirit should pulse and quicken ours. 'I am come,' the Saviour said, 'that you may have life—life; light; happiness; guidance; the joy of knowing that I love you; the power of health in all your thinking; the power of rightness in all your choices. This is the life I offer you, and the way of life everlasting.'

The road to this life and power is the road the Psalmist takes. He does a very simple, beautiful and efficient thing. And that is this. He permits God to speak to him. 'I will hear,' he says, 'what God the Lord will speak.' I will bring my mind to His Overmind. Here, if we will have it, is the secret of escape. Here is the way out of our confused thinking. Let us rest our spirit for ten minutes each day in His society. Be apart with Him. Be reverent. Be humble. Be still. Ask Him, as Jesus did, to speak. But remember there will be no dramatic miracle. If there is worry in the home or in our heart, we will not find that God is a magic wind to blow it clean away. But, for all that, one will still be a wonder to oneself. For we will find a new strength added to our will, a new clearness to our thought, a new pity to our judgment; and a new power to love, vibrant and victorious within our mind. And so a dream will come true. We will be made quiet. And enriched and enlarged.

---

[1] S. H. Moore, '*Wherewithal . . .*', 111.

In Miss Strickland's life of Queen Elizabeth we see a wise woman sometimes. Always a very vain one. Often revoltingly cruel. All three, and yet the breath of greatness was in her too. Before the Armada sailed, she spoke words to her Parliament that brayed like a thousand trumpets through the land. 'I have the body of a weak and feeble woman,' she flashed, 'but I have the heart of a king.' The mounting pride of race flames through her claim. But we who are Christ's men and women stand upon a rock that yields a confidence stronger and quieter still. Which is that, with the Christ-faith in us, we may always enter into a Divine presence, and hear a Divine voice, and come forth with a Divine strength to be our Divine selves, and with power in us to do the Divine will.

> So in the heart that knows Thy love, O Saviour,
> There is a temple sacred evermore,
> And all the tumult of life's angry voices
> Dies in hushed silence at its peaceful door.
> O rest of rests, O peace, serene, eternal,
> Thou ever livest and thou changest never,
> And in the secret of Thy presence dwelleth
> Fulness of joy for ever and for ever.[1]

Fifth Sunday after Epiphany.

Have you Answered the Door?

'Behold, I stand at the door, and knock.'—Rev 3^20.

The text recalls a verse in the Song of Songs, which in all probability inspired the picture that is given here. 'It is the voice of my beloved, saying, Open to me, my love, for my head is filled with dew and my locks with the drops of the night.' And, while this was but a fragment of a human love-song, it won its title to be called inspired. It found its way into the Bible, because the Bible is, above all else, the book of the heart. It is Divine because it is in the deepest and highest sense human; just as Jesus Himself is 'the Highest and most human too.'

With the text the message to the churches is at an end, and the final appeal is to the individual soul. Christ is represented as standing at the door of every human heart, knocking for entrance. That is the picture with which we are most familiar. The Christian preacher and artist of a generation ago were able to use it with more effect than it is being used to-day. Something has happened to turn the point of its appeal. The literal and matter-of-fact attitude of the modern mind has little time for mystical interpretations. If we tried a different line of approach, perhaps, we might find the point again. 'Behold, I stand at the door, and knock.'

Let us take the words in their ordinary natural sense, as if they were a true account of our relations one with another, as, indeed, they are. We are all standing and knocking at one another's doors, baffled by the barriers of silence and secrecy that lie between. An English officer, writing of his experiences during the War, and thinking especially of the comradeship that was possible under those conditions, living in freedom from ordinary conventions, sleeping in tents or in the open, side by side with his men, under the stars, says: 'What a wide human fellowship we are shut out from by the man who first invented a door!' We usually think of a door as a symbol of our security; we seldom think of it as a symbol of our insularity. It shuts us in with one another as members of a family; it may have the effect of shutting us out from a much wider human fellowship.

But even within the same family one member may be shut out from fellowship with the others. This is the door of personality. After a certain age, when we become self-conscious, it is closed for the most part, except to our nearest and dearest, and even to them it is not always open. Walter Pater once said that 'each individual was ringed round by that thick wall of personality through which no real voice has ever pierced on its way to him, able only to conjecture that which may be without.'

Yet personality is the one thing we can really know, though we understand it least of all. We say we know things, but we don't. We know them only in their relation to other things. We cannot know matter, because it is not real enough, because it has no inner core or unity to respond to our personality. We can only appeal to that which has an inner life of its own and is capable of response. Our dogs, for instance, may respond to us in a sort of way, but only up to a point can we have knowledge of them or they of us. It is only personality that can respond to personality; it is only the living that the living can really know. Only personal spirit can respond to personal spirit.

Yet, with it all, with all this marvellous capacity for knowledge of one another, this power of responding heart to heart, what miserably lonely isolated and insulated creatures we mortals usually are! How seldom do we allow ourselves to be to others what we really are. Our real life is not necessarily the life we live: our deepest thoughts are not necessarily the thoughts we speak.

---

[1] A. Maclean, *Walk in the Light*, 160.

Just the other day the wife of a man who had died wrote to her husband's friend to tell him of the death, and added: 'He never became unconscious, but said nothing about himself. I often wondered what was in his mind, but I could not bring myself to ask him.' That is the tragedy of the closed door.

There is a sense in which we are locked in by our self-made habits, and the power to unlock and open the heart must be of Christ Himself, although He may use some one else to help us open the door to Him. When we do open to Him and He comes in, we realize the importance of the active as against the passive aspect of our inner life. We realize that our personality is not simply a self-contained, self-sufficing centre of life, waiting to be assailed, but that it is an Active Will, a living, urgent presence that must go out of itself and enter into the lives of others to realize itself; a striving spirit, calling and responding out of the dark to the call of other spirits.

In that book of biography, *The Men of the Knotted Heart*, a story is told of Grant of Greenock, as he was familiarly known, how one Saturday night he arrived to preach at a mining village near Wishaw. Not knowing the way to the manse, he stopped at a cottage to ask. A woman came to the door and, seeing a minister standing there at that time of night, she was suddenly seized with terror and screamed, babbling something he could not make out. It was some time before he could make her realize that nothing was wrong and, when she became calm, she explained that her husband was working in a nearby coal-pit on the night-shift, and a minister's appearance at her door at that late hour immediately suggested to her mind that he was the bearer of bad news. It was a revelation to Grant of what may be on the other side of any door. What an agony of anxiety in that cry!

Yes, and there are worse things than these going on behind many a door, terrible things, shameful things, tragedies too deep for words. The news of a suicide, especially of one we knew, makes us feel uncomfortable. But what are we doing to prevent these happenings?

As Dr. J. H. Jowett once said: 'It is not only Christ who stands at the door and knocks. It is true of every one who has fellowship with Him. We must go where He goes and stand where He stands.'

Yet there is nothing we can do until the door of our own need has been thrown open. It is to this end that Christ stands and knocks.

The moment we open our hearts to Him, He comes in and takes possession. He will, then, answer the door for us to every knock that comes, be it friend or foe, good thought or bad thought. He will know whom or what to admit and whom or what to reject. And of this we may be sure, that 'nothing that defileth or that maketh a lie' will ever enter in. What a joy to any who come to us in trouble or distress, who knock at our door for help, to find that it is Christ Himself who answers the door! A door that used to be closed against Him and against others, a door which now can never be shut. There is no force in all the world so likely as interceding prayer to keep open our own door and to open the doors of others to the joy and fullness of the Presence of Him who stands and knocks.[1]

[1] E. Macmillan, *Finding and Following*, 47.

The Epistle of St. James.

By the Reverend H. G. Meecham,[1] M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Hartley Victoria College, Manchester.

I. Language and Style.—No traces of an Aramaic original were found, though there are occasional evidences of a Semitic, if not definitely Hebraic, thought-background. The absence of the article in 1^{20} is a case in point. Hort here translates, 'a petty passion of an individual soul,' but the phrase has a Semitic colouring. In the case of ἀκροατὴς ἐπιλησμονῆς (1^{25}) the Seminar was disinclined to allow a Semitism, He 3^{12} and Lk 18^{6} being quoted. He 3^{12} is the more nearly parallel, as Lk 18^{6} has the article and may mean 'the judge typical of this unrighteous order' (cf. Lk $16^{8.9}$). Ja 3^{13} offers another *possible* instance of Semitic genitive (cf. Wis 1^{10}, *Aristeas* 59 *al.*, *Enoch* 10^{16}).[1] Other points significant in this respect are the thrusting forward of τῶν ἵππων (Ja 3^{3}), the first clause of 3^{1}, and the position of ἅπαντες (3^{2}). Some members urged that the instances in $3^{2.3}$ were normal Greek, and attention was called to the variant reading in 3^{1}. It was agreed that the case for possible Semitisms might be discussed afresh, as the matter has an important bearing upon the question of authorship. Ac 15^{17} may be compared with Ja 2^{7} in this connexion. It was noted that Ac 15^{17}, whilst put in the mouth of James, is from the LXX, and that speeches in Acts seem to have been edited or composed by Luke.

---

[1] [In The Expository Times, October 1936, some findings on the First Epistle of St. Peter reached by corporate study in the Hellenistic Seminar of Manchester University were presented. A similar summary of the discussion on the Epistle of St. James is here given. The substance of this synopsis was drawn up by Dr. J. A. Findlay, the chairman. Dr. H. McLachlan, the secretary, recorded the summary, embodying certain modifications by the members. At the Editor's request and by authorization of the Seminar, Dr. H. G. Meecham has revised and prepared the statement for publication.]

The Greek of the Epistle is good Hellenistic and comes behind only the Epistle to the Hebrews and the preface to St. Luke's Gospel in point of correctness. Ropes declares even the usage in 2^{15} (the plural of the verb with two singulars connected by ἤ) to be in accord occasionally with that of good Greek writers. αὕτη for τοῦτο has respectable parallels (1^{27}). Fusion of strong and weak aorists is entirely absent from the Epistle, and if ἴστε (1^{19}) is Indicative (as R.V.) we have evidence of literary culture; οἴδατε, however, occurs in 4^{4}. Clearer evidence of education in the literary sense may be found in the use of such words as βρύω (here only in the Greek Bible), κάμνω (Wis., 4 Mac., He., and literate papyri), and εὐπειθής (4 Mac. and legal documents). Δίψυχος (1^{8} 4^{8}) is probably a coinage of the writer.[2] The use of tenses is often subtle, and shows an easy mastery of Greek (cf. 1^{23-25}). Whether hexametric or tetrametric rhythm underlies 1^{17}, its literary beauty is unmistakable. Other noteworthy passages are 1^{6-8} 3^{15-18}.

II. SUBJECT-MATTER.—The influence of Philo is very apparent. In $1^{26.27}$ 3^{6}, however, the nearest parallels to connexions of thought are Rabbinic. On the whole the Seminar did not think that the polemical passage 2^{18-26} necessarily presupposed the Epistle to the Romans, as 'faith *versus* works' was a stock subject of discussion in the synagogues of the period. The connexion between Ja 1^{22} and Ro 2^{13} is very close, however, though it is significant that where Paul has νόμου James has λόγου. The reading of Irenæus on James (*loc. cit.*), 'doer of words' (*i.e.* words of Jesus) was mentioned, and the Seminar was inclined to look for dependence rather on Q (cf. Mt 7^{24-27}, Lk 6^{47-49}) than on Paul for such ideas as these. Coincidences with the teaching of Jesus are more numerous and striking than is the case in any other New Testament epistle—a fact that gives the Epistle its special interest and value. The following are some of the more suggestive: Ja 1^{2} (Mt 5^{10-12}, Lk $6^{22.23}$) 1^{4} (Lk 21^{19}) 1^{5} (Mt 7^{7}, Lk 11^{9}) 1^{6} (Mk 11^{23}, Mt 21^{21} διακρινέσθαι) 1^{8} (Mt 14^{31}) $1^{9.10}$ (Mt 23^{12}, Lk 14^{11}) 1^{17} (Mt 7^{11}, Lk 11^{5-8}) 1^{21} (Lk 8^{8}—note the connexion between the implanted word and salvation in both passages), $1^{22\text{ff.}}$ (for νόμον τέλειον, cf. such teaching as Mt $7^{7.12.17.19.22}$) 1^{27} (Mt $25^{31\text{ff.}}$ ἐπισκεπτέσθαι), 2^{5} (Mt 5^{3}, Lk 6^{20}) 2^{7} (Mk 9^{41}) 2^{10} (Mt 5^{19}) 2^{13} (Mt $5^{7.18.30}$) 2^{14} (Mt 7^{21} $21^{18\text{ff.}}$, Lk 6^{46}) 3^{1} (Mt $23^{8.10}$, Lk $12^{47\text{ff.}}$) 3^{2} (Mt $12^{36.37}$) 3^{6} (Mt $15^{11.18.19}$, Mk $7^{15\text{ff.}}$—the defiling tongue) 3^{12} (Mt 7^{16}) 3^{13} (Mt 5^{16}) 3^{18} (Mt 5^{9}) 4^{4} (Lk 6^{26}, Mt 6^{24}) 4^{9} (Lk $6^{21.25}$) 4^{17} (Lk 12^{47}—it was suggested that this may be an agraphon, as Ephrem quotes it from Tatian's *Harmony*. The Bezan addition at Lk $6^{5.6}$ was cited as a parallel in thought) 5^{1} (Lk 6^{24}) 5^{2} (Mt 6^{19}, Lk 12^{33}) 5^{6} (Mt 23^{35}, Lk 11^{51}) 5^{7} (Mk $4^{26\text{ff.}}$) 5^{10} (Mt 5^{12}) 5^{12} (Mt $5^{33\text{ff.}}$; cf. 2 Co $1^{17.18}$), 5^{14} (Mk 6^{13}) 5^{15} (Mk $2^{4.5}$ and parallels). An interesting parallelism or contrast may be noted between the teaching about to-day and to-morrow, Mt 6^{34} and Ja $4^{13\text{ff.}}$ On the whole, the Seminar agreed with Zahn's verdict that the didactic style of James is second only to that of Jesus in point of trenchancy and pith. The language is sometimes that of the Rabbinic schools (*e.g.* Ja $2^{18\text{ff.}}$), but there are equally clear traces of the influence of the Greek diatribe and even of the style of the New Comedy (Ja $5^{13\text{ff.}}$).

The Seminar found nothing that compelled a date later than the sixth decade of the first century A.D. for the composition of the Epistle. If τὸν δίκαιον (5^{6}) be James himself (the members inclined to take the phrase in a general sense) the book in its present form must have been written after A.D. 62. No decisive evidence one way or the other was found. If the writer used our Gospels, the Epistle must have been comparatively late. But as the only saying (Ja 5^{12}; cf. Mt $5^{33\text{ff.}}$) that does not come from any generally acknowledged Q also underlies 2 Co $1^{17.\,18}$, where there can be no question of the use of one of our Gospels, we must assign it also to some collection of the sayings of Jesus, unless it is personal reminiscence. If James, the Lord's brother, really was the preacher, we might regard the Epistle as a first-hand source for the teaching of Jesus. This is by no means out of the question.

---

[1] See J. H. Moulton, *Prolegomena*, 74, 235. Also W. F. Howard (in Moulton, *Gram.*, ii. 440), in whose full note the New Testament instances are conveniently marshalled and further references given.

[2] Analogous formations elsewhere made it an easy coinage. The word is frequent in Hermas and early Christian literature.

Attention was paid to what has been called the diluted Christianity of the Epistle in the light of Dr. J. H. Moulton's theory that it was meant to present the ethical teaching of Jesus to non-Christian Jews in a form which would offer the fewest possible hindrances to their acceptance of it. In this connexion Ja 2^{1} was felt to be important, and the interesting suggestion was made that we should read Χριστοῦ closely with τῆς δόξης. After a long discussion the Seminar inclined to the view that the words Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ have been interpolated to give the Epistle a more canonical look. The parallel of the Christian additions to the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* was adduced. The members were not so clear concerning the same words in 1^{1}, though perhaps their omission also should logically follow. Even if the words are allowed to stand in both places, the rarity of the name was felt to be important. Careful investigation of the distinction between κύριος and ὁ κύριος was seen to be necessary. The word is used five times without the article and nine times with it. Ja 1^{1} appears to be the only place where it is used for Christ without the article—perhaps a slight argument against the authenticity of the words Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Of the instances where the article is used five refer to Yahweh, three to Christ, and one (4^{15}) might be either. In Matthew and Mark κύριος generally means Yahweh, ὁ κύριος = Jesus. In Luke the usage is much less uniform; ὁ κύριος = Jesus seventeen times, Yahweh nine times, and the proportions are nearly the same for Acts. In John ὁ κύριος always means Jesus. In all New Testament writers except Luke, the rule κύριος = Yahweh, ὁ κύριος = Jesus seems to hold good, though Old Testament quotations produce disturbance in the usage. Even in Ja 1^{7} 4^{15}, ὁ κύριος might conceivably stand for Jesus, and 5^{11} is an Old Testament quotation. A similar investigation into the usage of νόμος and ὁ νόμος yielded the following results. The word is used without the article six times in the Epistle, with the article twice only. In the two instances with the article the phrase obviously stands for the Law of Moses ($2^{9.\,10}$); in four of the six occurrences without the article the Seminar saw a reference to the 'law' of Christ (1^{25} $2^{8.\,12}$ 4^{11}). In 2^{11} παραβάτης νόμου may be thought of as practically equivalent to rebel. No uniform usage of this sort appears to be discernible in the New Testament, but the idea of the two laws is everywhere present in the First Gospel.

The conclusion would seem to be that we have in the Epistle a series of addresses or fragments of addresses delivered in Palestine, then edited and worked over by a Hellenist student of Philo. Dr. J. H. Moulton's theory that a Christian is here appealing to non-Christian Jews does not seem to account for the polemic in Ja $2^{14\text{ff.}}$. There would seem to be little point in a Christian championing works *versus* faith to a Jewish audience. On the other hand, the theory that James is here attacking or replying to Paul likewise seems not proven. It is possible, however, that he has in mind such perversions of the Pauline doctrine as were current when, for example, Ro 3^{31} was written. No very late date is needed for such an abuse of the idea underlying Ro 4^{5} to need correction. Paul and James in this regard might be thought of rather as parallel developments than as cause and effect. Apart from this passage the Seminar found little guidance in the dating of the Epistle. Ja 5^{14} can be paralleled by Mk 6^{13}, and a Palestinian climate seems presupposed in 4^{7}.

Recent Foreign Theology.

The Theology of the Gospels.

These two pamphlets[1] are special reprints from the *Theologische Blätter* (Theological Pages). The first (Nos. 9 and 10) deals with 'The Eschatology of the Gospels, its History and Meaning'; and the second (No. 11) with 'Johannine Thought,' and is described as 'A contribution to the recognition of Johannine peculiarity.' They may be dealt with together.

(1) Professor Kümmel in four pages discusses the interpretations which have been given before

---

[1] *Die Eschatologie der Evangelien; ihre Geschichte und ihr Sinn*, von Professor Werner Georg Kümmel; *Johanneisches Denken*, von Walther von Loewenich (Heinsiches Verlag, Leipzig; M.1.80 each).

stating his own conclusions from the study of the historical development in the New Testament. It may be assumed that Jesus did continue the Baptist's call to repentance in view of coming judgment, but what He chiefly preached was that God's sovereignty was near; and, although He here took up a Jewish thought, He was not interested in the catastrophic occurrences expected, but in God's action in all its power, apart from all nationalist hopes. He did not describe the *salvation* of that sovereignty in any detail; but His emphasis lay here, as He claimed to be preaching the gospel. This saving sovereignty, while still future, is being already anticipated in Jesus' presence and activity. Eschatology thus becomes Christology. All changes in the eschatology of the primitive Christian churches are accordingly bound up with the development of the Christology.

The experience of the primitive community of the resurrection of Jesus, of His heavenly activity, and of present salvation, strengthened the conviction of the presence of the divine sovereignty as an anticipation of the end; and even the apocalyptic ideas were transformed by the central position of Christ. Paul's preaching was essentially a preaching of Christ, and his eschatology was a development of that of Jesus, due to the realities of Easter and Whitsuntide. While recognizing the emphasis in the Fourth Gospel on the present salvation in Christ, the author insists that the current eschatology as here preserved must not be regarded as an alien element inserted by an editor, but as an essential part of the teaching. The apparent contradictions he resolves by asserting that 'the Gospel of John undertakes the bold attempt to expound the faith in the divine dignity of Jesus Christ in the form of a historical narrative of the life of a man' (p. 26). Accordingly, the belief in the historical revelation in Christ demands a future as well as a present, in short an eschatology. While for us belief in the details and the immediacy of this eschatology is impossible, yet we too must have a belief that God's saving sovereignty in Christ will have a historical consummation. This pamphlet offers a careful and trustworthy exegetical basis for the Christian hope and can be confidently commended.

(2) Docent von Loewenich's pamphlet equally deserves appreciative attention. At the start he insists on the originality of the Johannine writings and the abandonment of the Pauline interpretation. He sets aside several modes of approaching an understanding, such as the Gnostic, the philosophical idealist, according to which historical facts are resolved into eternal truths, and the symbolic, which resolves this history into truths, and not realities. While an allegorical exegesis is in some cases more realistic than a historical; yet for the author of this literature truth has become reality. 'The myth in the form of reflection becomes a metaphysic' (p. 8). To this higher realism the sacramental interpretation also points.

The peculiarity of Johannine thought needs to be constantly remembered. The contrast to the Synoptics and Paul makes this apparent. The thinking is not logical, but contemplative, a meditation on the pregnant vision of Christ. No strict arrangement is, or can be, here followed. It is organic in growing out of its object, around which the mind is spirally moving; there is repetition and yet advance; ideas overlap as all relate to the one theme. The conceptions are absolute as they refer to ultimate reality, the last words of truth. Convinced of the actuality of the events the Evangelist records, that for him is secondary to the symbolic significance. Unlike Kümmel, von Loewenich maintains that eschatology in the writings falls into the background. The pamphlet concludes by an examination of characteristic Johannine conceptions to illustrate this peculiarity of thinking. It is the duty of theology and Church, the author insists, to take this peculiarity more seriously. So taken, one of the most precious treasures of the Bible will be found in the Johannine writings. One is glad to meet with positive critical writings.

Alfred E. Garvie.

London.

Varia.

The current issue of the *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (Töpelmann, Berlin; Band 14, Heft 1-2) contains material which is even more varied than usual. The first article is an essay, by the veteran W. Staerk, on the Old Testament doctrine of election, in which the author traces first the belief in the choice of special persons—Israel as a people, its king, and its priests, and then the selection of the one site on which sacrifice might be offered, calling attention to the divergent theories represented by Deuteronomy and by the priestly writings. Hänel, already well known in this country for his work on Chronicles, discusses the sacrificial laws presupposed in that book, with special reference to the part played by priests, levites, and the laity, in the actual offering of the victim, and draws attention to an ancient Midrashic tradition embedded in the book. Several articles are more closely concerned with exegesis. Munch contributes a discriminating study of the problem of wealth as approached in Pss 37, 49, and 73, stressing the illuminating fact that the writer of Ps 49 is almost alone among Hebrew thinkers in placing a comparatively low value on material prosperity. Striedl has a brilliant exposition of the literary character of the Book of Esther, in which he shows how its grammar is that of a scholarly Jew who is deliberately adopting an archaistic style, and adds a fine appreciation of his quality as a story-teller—we might almost say, as a novelist. Dornseiff continues the application of his classical scholarship to the Old Testament, and, among other points, makes some interesting remarks on the evidence to be gathered from the Balaam story as to early history in the eastern Mediterranean. Several articles deal with philological matters; G. R. Driver, for example, has more to say about the meaning of *nephesh*, and adds some notes on suggestions made by Junker in *Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments*. D. W. Thomas has an important note on a possible meaning of the Hebrew word *shanah*, especially in Pr 5[9] and Is 11[11], while Köhler continues his special investigation of the meanings of Hebrew words. Some of the fourteen cases with which he deals are especially interesting and important. Hempel himself devotes some pages to a discussion of papyrus fragments of the Greek Deuteronomy, dating from the second century B.C., and draws from them the justifiable conclusion that the text of the LXX as we now have it is, in the main, reliable. We also have an identification of some fragments of a lost work by Philo, the *Quaestiones in Genesin et in Exodum*, from the pen of Früchtel, who has been able to assign to their proper places notes that defeated even Rendel Harris. Finally, special mention may be made of the brief accounts given of articles dealing with the Old Testament which have appeared in a very large number of periodicals since the last issue of the *ZAW*. It is no disparagement of the original contributions which this journal contains to say that in this feature we have something which is indispensable to every serious student of the Old Testament. While it may be taken for granted that the best examples of the work being done to-day on the Old Testament will find expression in the *ZAW* itself, there remains an enormous mass of material which requires just the kind of sifting and presentation which Hempel and his colleagues give us with such unwearied diligence.

In a recent issue of the *ZAW* Professor Volz put forward a plea for a genuinely scientific and systematic approach to the problems of textual criticism in the Old Testament, together with some practical suggestions. These included the intensive study of different portions of the field by different scholars, and, as if in response to this appeal, Dr. Martin Rehm has published his investigations into the text of the parallel passages in 2 S and 1 and 2 K on the one hand, and 1 and 2 Ch on the other.[1] The greater part of the work is devoted to a study of the relation between the Massoretic Text and the Septuagint in the two books. This is important, not only for the light it throws on the particular books studied, but for its contribution to the general question of the value of the LXX for the restoration of the original text, and for its illustration of the kind of error that has crept into the Hebrew text from time to time. Thus (though Dr. Rehm does not emphasize this point) the list of variations involving different consonants shows that the changes were made for the most part after the adoption of the square character, not through confusions in the older forms of the letters. There is also a judicious summary of the textual relations between the two books. The whole work has been done with that meticulous thoroughness which we have learnt to expect from Catholic scholars in Germany, and the only regret the reader will have is that Dr. Rehm did not append a short chapter summarizing his conclusions.

T. H. Robinson.

Cardiff.

---

[1] *Textkritische Untersuchungen zu den Parallelstellen der Samuel-Königsbücher und der Chronik*, von Dr. Theol. Martin Rehm (Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Münster; R.M.7.50).

◆

Old Texts in Modern Translations.

Luke xxiv. 35 (Moffatt).

By the Reverend James Reid, D.D., Eastbourne.

'They related their own experience.' The lovely story of the walk to Emmaus tells of one of the ways in which the Risen Christ made Himself known to His followers. He joined two of them as a stranger when they were going home from Jerusalem where they had seen Him crucified. The story shines with the radiance of a real experience. These disciples had been so broken in spirit, so utterly cast down, that nothing short of a meeting with Christ could have restored their faith, and sent them back post-haste to the other disciples to tell them about it. And this is how they brought home to the rest the conviction that Christ had risen. They described what had happened to themselves. The A.V. says: 'They told what things were done in the way.' And Dr. Moffatt translates it: 'They related their own experience.'

They would never have got the truth of the Resurrection home in any other way. If they had said that they had heard a rumour that Christ had risen, no one would have believed them. They were too far gone in despair. The thing was too incredible. Certainly no one would have been convinced. The cloud that hung over their hearts would never have been lifted. As it was, it took a little time for the truth to get through, and for the disciples to become adjusted to this amazing fact; for it meant a sort of revolution in their minds. But the story of these two men did carry conviction, because it was something that had actually happened to themselves. They had seen the Risen Christ. Their hearts had kindled into a blaze of love and faith. Their very faces shone with the glow of it. There was no mistaking that they were talking of something real; and so their story got home and the news thrilled its way from heart to heart, because it was the story of an experience.

There is all the difference between a theory and an experience. Theory may interest us, but it does not carry conviction. A man may tell us something that is true, which he has thought out or read in a book; and what he says may be interesting though we may feel there is something lacking. But when the expert begins to talk, the man who has had first-hand experience, there is a different feel about it. He knows. He has tried the thing out. He has been there.

The value and the power of the New Testament is that it is a statement of experience. It is more than that of course. It contains certain deductions from experience; but it is all based on the facts of experience. The people who wrote the Gospels were not mere biographers, writing up a story from what others had told them about Jesus. They were all people who had had experience of Christ. Some of them had known Him in the flesh and were writing down what they had known and felt about Him, the effect He had had on their lives and their hearts. The First Epistle of John begins: 'That which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life, that declare we unto you.' They were telling their experience. But even if some of them had not known Christ so intimately in the flesh, they had all had experience of His power in their hearts and lives. They had all been thrilled and captured by His love. They had all been changed by His grace and goodness. They had all known the touch of His Spirit in the depth of their souls. That which He came to do for men had been done in them. The result was that their words about Him, their descriptions of Him, their picture of Him as He walked and talked in Galilee, and hung on the Cross and then rose from the dead, have the quality of a first-hand experience. They could write about Him as Saviour because He had saved them. They could reveal Him as Lord because He had won their hearts and awakened their worship. When they wrote the Gospels they were relating their own experience.

It is the same with the Apostle Paul. Some people think of him only as a theological theorist, spinning doctrines out of his big brain, some of which are very difficult to understand, and which have very little relation to ordinary life. But there was hardly a word that Paul said that was not based on experience. His own life has been changed by meeting with Christ. The story of it he was never tired of telling. There is no getting away from it. When he speaks of Christ, he is speaking of One he has known and knows. When he tells of Christ's power to save, he is relating an experience, for Christ had saved him. That experience, like a melody in a great symphony, underlies all his theology, every now and again breaking through with the simple joy of it.

When he speaks of Christ's death and resurrection, he does not tell the story like one quoting from a book, or repeating a bit of ancient history. He is telling of an experience. For the Cross had been a power in his own life, slaying the old proud self-righteous self; and the Risen Christ had raised him from the grave of despair into which he had sunk, and had called him forth to live through Him in newness of life. Even in what we call his theology, he is relating an experience.

That is what the Bible gives us all the time—a record of experience. It is not a book of theories or essays about religion. We have plenty of these and they can be interesting enough. But the Bible is different. That is why it can be trusted, and will never lose its interest. 'He hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of His dear Son.' That is experience: the thing had actually happened. 'One thing I know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see.' That is the accent of the New Testament. It is experience. It tells of a power in Christ which was actually at work and which remains to be explored and used, as men have explored and used the powers of electricity since first the discovery broke upon the world. We can explain it as we like, but we cannot explain it away. For these changed lives are facts. These new natures are facts. These deliverances from sin are facts. These new powers, coming into the hearts of simple men and women and remaking them, are facts. 'They related their own experience.'

What was the nature of that experience which the two disciples described? It was not merely of the eyes, as of one watching a ship at sea or a man on the street. It was an experience of the soul, as of one watching a sunrise. For something had happened to them and in them that day on the Emmaus road. They had been in touch with the spirit of Christ in this man who was a stranger. There is no other way of becoming aware of Christ as a reality, than through contact with His Spirit, kindling conscience, and bringing strength and healing and peace. Only what is of the spirit, only truth and love and goodness, can be a reality to our spirits, and can make us aware of Christ.

That contact with His Spirit brought them two things as they and the stranger went together along the road. For one thing, a new light broke into their minds. They saw the world as the sphere of God's purpose. They realized that God is a living God, and that life has a meaning and a plan. The drama of the Cross, which had seemed senseless tragedy, was all in God's purpose, and had been turned into victory. That illumination of the meaning of life and of history is part of the work of Christ. He gives us faith in God, and assures us that life has a meaning, and that His loving purpose is behind it all. There is nothing more important for us in these days than just that—to recover faith in the ultimate meaning of life with all it holds of suffering and evil, and to see this world of ours as the sphere of God's purpose of love. Many people to-day are losing heart because they are losing faith in life and its meaning. That is what Christ can restore.

But this experience did more than illumine their minds. It brought into their hearts a new hope, a new courage, a new peace, a new love. It reinforced their personalities, changing them from the mood of utter despair to faith, and from discouragement to the assurance of triumph. 'Did not our heart burn within us,' they said, 'while he talked with us by the way?'

It is this experience which it is the work of Christ to reproduce. The Christian life is the life that comes out of and is inspired by it. It is the same experience as that which came to these two disciples. It is the awareness of a Presence in our life with whom we are in touch. That is the meaning of what we call the living Christ. We are living to-day in the age of the Resurrection, the new age that began when Christ came into the world and lived and died and rose again. We celebrate this fact every Easter day. But it is the fact that the Christian Sunday was instituted to celebrate. 'This day my Saviour rose.' Every day for a Christian man is Easter day. Every morning is Easter morning. The world in which we live is a world that is different because Christ lives in it, and is waiting to meet us along the roads of defeat or helplessness, where we often walk with downcast hearts because we think the world is empty of God. In every crisis of decision, in every opportunity, in every challenge, He is offering Himself to us, seeking to make touch with us and to awaken our faith and obedience.

The experience of Christ is that of a new power at work within us, lighting up our minds, giving us new heart for life, making us strong to overcome trouble and temptation, and filling our hearts with love and devotion to Himself. That means that the Resurrection is not only a fact of history: it is a spiritual experience. It is the experience of a new life quickened and inspired by Him, a new love, a victorious power through which in us He lives and triumphs. A Chinese magistrate who was converted describes his experience thus: 'When Lazarus came from the dead I don't know what change took place, but I am perfectly sure I have risen from the dead, because my body, mind, and soul have a new strength as real as if an invisible companion were constantly beside me.' That is exactly what happened to these men, and it is the Christian experience. The events of Christ's life in Palestine become experiences of the soul. As an old mystic puts it:

Though Christ a thousand times in Bethlehem were born,
If He's not born in thee, thy soul is yet forlorn.

Christ rose not from the dead; Christ still is in the grave,
If thou for whom He died art still of sin the slave.

The Christian experience is not a theory about Christ, not knowledge about Him, not merely the convictions which He awakens, though these are vital. It is this also—a new spirit, a new victory over the world that springs from these convictions rooted in the heart and rising into the flower and fragrance of a new life.

This experience has the power to interest people and to bring conviction. It is in this way most of all that Christianity is spread. The Church grows like every other living organism, by the propagation of its own life. True preaching is, in its essence, the witness to an experience. Whether it be explicit or no, there must be the consciousness that we are relating our own experience. Mere teaching will never spread the gospel. Though the story is essential, merely telling the story of Christ, unless it has kindled our own hearts, will not do it. We must tell that story with the accents of those who have been there with Christ in Galilee, and at the Empty Tomb, and in the Upper Room where He appeared. It is telling that story with the note of experience, the glow in the heart that He has kindled which makes Christ real. There is a proverb that an ounce of practice is worth a ton of theory. That is true about living Christianity. But it is true also about the spread of the gospel. An ounce of experience is worth a ton of theology. 'Preachers,' says Mr. Hugh Redwood, speaking of his youthful days at church services, 'put forward their theories and elaborate their codes, but they rarely spoke of personal experiment. They rarely told you, for instance, that they knew of God's power to break a man of bad habits because He had broken bad habits for them. And that is the very thing people would have been interested to know.' An audience will hold their breath for a moment when a speaker begins to tell some experience of his own. It may be very simple and very elementary. But when we can tell some one how God has met us, or how His power came into our own life, or how it was that Christ became a reality to us—that gets home. There is something in that witness that gets through closed doors, and finds its way straight into the heart.

Is not this the reason why the spread of Christianity is so slow to-day? There are so few Christian people passing on their own experience. It was in this way that Christianity spread in the early days. 'The disciples went everywhere preaching the word.' And preaching the word meant relating their own experience. Why do *we* not spread it and pass it on? Is it reserve? Or do we shrink from doing anything that might suggest to other people that we think we are better than they? We all dislike a prig; and to talk down to people from a superior height is a form of spiritual pride that every healthy-minded man detests.

But these disciples never said to people or conveyed to them the impression that they thought themselves superior. They made no claim to a goodness of their own. Paul and Peter must often have humbled themselves to the dust when they drew back the curtain from the past and told of their own failures. What they did say was something about Christ, not about themselves. They talked about God's power and forgiveness, and the new peace and love which He had brought into their lives. If they claimed the power to stand up to trouble and to conquer temptation and evil habits, it was no credit to them, and they gave Him the glory. It was all His doing, His grace; and it was that grace and love of God in their own experience of which they spoke. Their message was a kind of mirror in which there was reflected the beauty and majesty of Christ. When Paul had finished talking, it was not Paul his audience saw, but Christ, and Him crucified.

What was more, they wanted to tell of Christ. They burned to pass on the news. Can we imagine a man meeting the Risen Christ when every one thought Him dead, and not spreading the news? Is this not often the trouble that our experience of God's grace is not deep enough, not decisive enough, not glowing enough, for us to want to pass it on, even in a very simple way? That is the real root of the lack of interest in the work of Foreign Missions. Thousands of professedly Christian people never take even a languid interest in the subject. They treat it as if it were the hobby of the ultra-pious, instead of the very life-blood of the Church. They may give us reasons if we ask them, perhaps that threadbare and tattered idea that the religions of the heathen are good enough for them. But the real reason is simply that they are not conscious of anything vital they want to pass on. They have no experience they want to relate. There is no glow in the heart that makes it burn with love for Christ and for people, no radiance that comes from the sense of deliverance, no consciousness of a gift that Christ has brought into their own lives. If Christ has kindled His glory in our own hearts, we will want to send it forth to light up the ancient darkness of the world.

It comes back to this, does it not, that the real need of the world is first of all a need in the Church. We need to recover the spiritual glow. It may be the need of a fresh experience of the love of Christ. We may need to make conscious to ourselves afresh all we owe to Him, for we can become so familiar with our blessings that we cease to realize them, and the wonder dies out of the heart. Christ lives. That is the fact that made the Church and brought it into being out of the pit of a deadly despair. Because He lives there is open for us in Him the light and the power that the world needs—the light for all its problems, the love that can dissolve our frictions and drive the wheels of our common life. But how can He find contact with the world? Only through us, through the Church, as we go forth to meet Him on the road where He is waiting, like a Stranger, to join Himself to us and make our hearts burn as He talks with us by the way. As we listen to Him with wills alert for obedience, He kindles the glow of faith and love and gratitude which can set other hearts aflame.

Contributions and Comments.

Exodus xv. 2: עָזִּי וְזִמְרָת יָהּ

Mr. Ellison surely misses the point. It is not here a question of what sounds more poetic, but of what, in fact, the author wrote. My critic and I may well agree that 'the Lord is my strength and *song*' is a finer phrase than 'the Lord is my stronghold and *protection*,' but that does not prove that the author wrote it.

The word זִמְרָה, 'protection,' has, as I showed, good philological support, and that it indeed existed in the Hebrew vocabulary is shown by such proper names as זִמְרִי of the Old Testament and בעלזמר of the Samarian Ostracon, No. 12.[1] Moreover, it is not without significance that LXX here renders *σκεπαστής*, pointing to knowledge of the verb זמר, 'protect.'[2]

It should be added that עָזִּי, which MT points as if derived from root עזז, 'be strong,' ought perhaps to be referred in reality to the root עוז, 'seek refuge' (Is 30^{2}, Jer 4^{6}, etc.), underlying מָעוֹז and cognate with Arabic *ʿawadha.* The same interpretation would seemingly obtain also in Is 26^{1}, עִיר עָז־לָנוּ יְשׁוּעָה יָשִׁית חוֹמוֹת וָחֵל, where עִיר עז must be identical with the familiar עִיר מָעוֹז (Is 17^{9}), and where the phrasing accords entirely with the words עָזִּי . . . וַיְהִי־לִי לִישׁוּעָה in our passage.

In general, Mr. Ellison does not appear to appreciate the fact that poetic taste is no scientific criterion, and that, as Gilbert Murray has observed, it is even possible to accept as a poetic translator a rendering one would reject as a scholar. Nor is one necessarily insensible to the poetry of a phrase because one believes that, in point of fact, a given author never wrote it in a given passage.

Of course, I do not claim that זִמְרָה *must* mean here what I say it means, but Mr. Ellison's argument does not suffice to disprove it.

Finally, I may mention that the identification of זִמְרָה with the Arabic root *dhamara* has, as I now see, been anticipated by I. Zolli in *Giornalè della Societa Asiatica Italiana*, 1935, p. 290.

Theodor H. Gaster.

London.

---

[1] On the connexion of names with *Zimri-* with S. Arabian *dh-m-r*, see Ranke, *Early Babylonian Personal Names of the Hammurabi Dynasty*, p. 29.

[2] The word זִמְרָה, 'protection,' may also be seen in Job 35^{10}, נֹתֵן זְמִרוֹת בַּלָּיְלָה; LXX, however, there renders *φυλακάς* which points to שְׁמֻרוֹת, cf. Ps 77^{5}: *φυλακάς*=שְׁמֻרוֹת.

Entre Nous.

A Novelist on Noah: A Problem in Method.

This book on *Noah*, by Mr. R. H. Mottram (Rich & Cowan; 5s. net), is a notable addition to a series of biographies which aims at presenting the lives of well-known Biblical figures in a popular form such as will appeal both to laymen without special knowledge of critical matters and to historians and churchmen of all creeds. This account of Noah will certainly be a 'popular' biography: whether it is exactly a biography is another question. But Mr. Mottram is not overmuch concerned with this aspect of the matter. He says explicitly that the book is not meant for students, and will not add to exact knowledge. He is out, not to praise the critics, but to rescue Noah from them; for he holds that, with their dismembering tactics and their theories of eponymous heroes, etc., they have pretty nearly disposed of the patriarch altogether, leaving as 'the most certain thing about him that his name was not Noah.'

Yet with all his protestations, Mr. Mottram makes full use of all information available, and he is an adept at suggesting analogies from folklore and recent literature. His own literary style is fascinating—perhaps at times too self-consciously clever—and the first part of the book at least will hold the attention of that large reading public, actively intelligent, but without special critical equipment, for whom it is intended. His method of presentation differs from that of the critics in that it is synthetic rather than analytic. He unites, indeed, memory with imagination, but he claims precedence for what he would regard as a legitimate and even sanctified use of the imagination, and he is not inclined to sift memories with the exactitude of a historian.

In the course of his studies Mr. Mottram has developed a strong affection for Noah. Few characters, according to him, are so convincing. His notoriety is remarkable, especially with the English-speaking people, into whose imagination the Authorized Version has placed him with a success rivalled by no other translation. Mr. Mottram is convinced that the brilliant sarcasm of an Anatole France would have been impossible if he had read the Book of Genesis in English. Whatever the truth of this conjecture, the fact remains that the story of Noah, although it suffered a temporary eclipse in popularity during the machine-worshipping and comfort-loving nineteenth century, has captured, to a far greater extent than Adam or Abraham or even King David, the hearts of the simplest and least articulate peasants, has penetrated the folklore of all parts of the country, has led working-men to christen their sons by his name, and—last but not least—has provided a toy for the nursery of perennial charm, unrivalled even by the most elaborate models of the building of the Temple or of any other Old Testament occurrence.

Mr. Mottram locates the Flood in Mesopotamia, and regards it, not as a universal, but as a ubiquitous deluge—ubiquitous in the sense that it is one of many stories of a similar character, although distinguished from them by greater moral alertness. The consideration that the Deluge is not universal does not lessen its impressiveness in an age when communications between countries, and even between districts, were practically non-existent, and the locality constituted the world; and the ubiquitousness showed that in the Flood story there is a recollection which concerned all humanity. As regards date, although the author suggests that 'no one would have dared to call him Neolithic to his face,' Noah is placed in the age when only flint and stone instruments were known, the reason for this conclusion being that when so many instructions for the building of the Ark are given by 'a severely technical Almighty'—to quote the author's description—iron or bronze instruments would certainly have been mentioned, had they been in existence.

Noah is not only an actual human being, but a type. He is the first human being, in an age when society is in a state of transition from the nomad to the pastoral and agricultural condition, who seems to have been capable of using his imagination, and looking before and after. He alone, in contrast to the slothful and indifferent dwellers in the plain, with their 'easy-going confidence that the work in hand will get done even if no one does it,' being himself of a more virile stock, and noting signs obvious to those who had eyes to see, could envisage the approaching catastrophe and take measures for escape. He interpreted the coming doom as a judgment from a God of righteousness, who repented Him of having created man, a 'repentance' which Mr. Mottram artistically illustrates by a quotation from Galsworthy's 'Holiday' and by a comparison with the feeling of an official who by organization and sanitation has made possible the teeming population of an Oriental city, and then wonders despondingly if all his labours have been worth while, when he sees what the inhabitants have made of their security.

So Noah, 'according to all that God commanded him' went about his boat-building. Of which Mr. Mottram uses all his novelist's art to give a most picturesque and delightful account. Far more ambitious than his great follower, Robinson Crusoe, he builds, not indeed a travelling menagerie, but a cattle-boat; for our author, even with all his respect for the use of the imagination, refuses to allow the Ark to contain all the inhabitants of a Whipsnade, being deterred chiefly by the obvious difficulty of watering them when adrift on saltish floods. Noah is a 'man of destiny,' standing out 'even more distinctly over against his fellow-creatures because he does not chatter,' laughing rarely but with gusto, concerned principally to get something practical done, managing his conglomerate company of the Ark (including his wife and daughters-in-law) with consummate ability; and when at last the waters dried from off the face of the earth, getting them all out again safely on dry land by breaking through the covering of the Ark, because the one and only door—which is compared to the kitchen-hatch of a modern passenger liner—had jammed; carrying through the whole enterprise so successfully that the multitude of his descendants which is stated so generously in the Genesis story, may be taken as a delicate compliment to Noah's organizing ability.

What of the moral and religious value of the story, according to Mr. Mottram? He passes slightly over the lapse at the end of the story, which, he holds, shows Noah to have been human and not a demi-god, and which he might have been thankful to the critics for reminding him, is omitted altogether in the more priestly source of the Genesis narrative. He gives us on the whole a convincing picture of a deeply religious man who, in the days when 'the old direct appeal of a deity to a universe completely under his control' was still possible, heard 'the voice of God,' and responded by his native sheer capacity, 'which it is more graceful to call righteousness.' At any rate, we are told in the Bible that 'Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord,' and Mr. Mottram finds evidence of the grace throughout the whole story, especially in Noah's act of sacrifice and worship at the ending of the Flood, and in his discovery—expressed in what our author calls 'one of the most inspired sentences in the language' and 'the basis of the conception of a reasonable and beneficent Creator who has been the father of the spirit of how many generations of English thought and feeling'—of the significance of the rainbow, with all that it meant as an assurance of God's care 'in seed-time and harvest, while the earth remaineth.' Noah's experience meant an advance in the religious confidence of the race.

Repudiating God.

In *The War against God* Mr. Sidney Dark and Mr. R. S. Essex (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net) tell the story of how countries to-day are repudiating God bitterly and systematically—Russia, Germany, Turkey, and Mexico, and it may also be Spain—and how others again are repudiating Him politely. The example they give of this is—England. In their foreword the authors explain the purpose of the book 'It is, therefore, of importance to have accurate knowledge of the reason why God is regarded as the enemy, and for what end He is to be expelled from the world which He created. It seems to us idle folly to shudder at what may be the blasphemies of the unbeliever and to pass by on the other side with cotton-wool in one's ears. We have listened to him as attentively as we can, and have made a careful note of what he has said. That note may have its uses because we find little that is admirable in the habit of men of strong convictions refusing to study the case of their opponents.'

Before coming to the present day a good historical sketch is given of the rise and development of critical thought about God—in the two chapters entitled 'From Job to Machiavelli' and 'From Luther to Comte.' We must not forget to mention also the interesting short summary of the teaching of H. G. Wells, Bernard Shaw, Hardy, and A. E. Housman, J. B. S. Haldane, Middleton Murry, Bertrand Russell, C. E. Joad, and Aldous Huxley. This summary refreshes our memory and gives even well-known facts a new touch which makes their significance clearer.

Even those well informed will be surprised at the cumulative effect on their minds of the facts presented by this book, and will be compelled to ask themselves again and again how far the defects of the Church have contributed to the widespread war against God.

One of the most interesting chapters deals with Mexico. The position in Mexico has developed in a similar way to the position in Russia, Germany, and Spain. It began by anti-clericalism and it then developed into anti-theism. The Government claims that the former was due to the opposition of the Church to all social and economic progress. When the constitution was reformed the Secretary for Education asserted: 'The public power recovered fully the guidance of childhood and youth, permitting them to create a rational concept of the universe and of the social life, repelling the imposition of all religious doctrine by the instructors, in order to substitute, for fanaticism and social prejudices, scientific truth.'

And this is how 'scientific education' is established. It is a quotation from an official school Reader:

'Mama believes that the strike can be settled by prayers. If the boss knew this, how he would laugh! Then mother "confessed," and told the priest all about the strike. The curate is not in our situation and, as he does not know the indignity of being paid a miserable salary, and since he has never worked with his hands, he counselled my mother, RESIGNATION, and to bear everything in the LOVE OF GOD. A beautiful formula. Very convenient. But it did not convince my father.

'If the owner throws you out: "Resign thyself."

'If the boss fires you: "Resign thyself."

'If the boss kills you with hunger: "Resign thyself."

'And all for the love of God, who permits the bosses to exploit the working man. This is all that a man who is called a shepherd of souls and who gives his hand hypocritically to be kissed, could counsel. I am going to find a more practical formula.'

More about Canon Sheppard.

We are glad to give in this issue an account of Canon Sheppard's work written by one who knew both it and Canon Sheppard himself intimately. It will be remembered that in the solemn procession from St. Martin's to St. Paul's Cathedral it was Mr. Johnston who walked with Major Sheppard, the Canon's brother, behind the flower-laden hearse. The article appears in our 'Christianity in Action' series, and it is interesting to notice that Mr. Max Plowman, writing in the *St. Martin's Review* for December, strikes the same note. He says, 'The Peace Pledge Union stood to him for Christianity in action. He believed that, irrespective of creed, "by their works ye shall know them."'

'I have never known a Christian less concerned about the articles of his faith; and very certainly I have never known—nor ever hope to know—one as hourly concerned with the practice of his religion. Only a month or two before he died, I remember his saying to a small company of his closest friends: "When a man has had as much experience as I've had, he gets to know what he can do and what he can't. I know that I can't preach, and I know that I can't write; but I tell you what I'm good at: I'm a good mixer."'

Blessed are the good mixers, for they shall prove to be the only practical peacemakers.

The *St. Martin's Review* for December is largely devoted to Dr. Sheppard's life and work, and many will want to get a copy. Attention might also be drawn to *Dick Sheppard and St. Martin's*. This contains a good history of St. Martin's with a chapter on Dr. Sheppard and another on the Reverend Pat M'Cormick. The author is the Reverend R. J. Northcott of St. Martin's (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net). From the appreciations in the *Review* we give three short quotations:

The Archdeacon of Northumberland:

'Whether we were talking sad things or gay things—he was a peerless maker of laughter—or discussing difficult problems, when the moment of leaving came, one closed his door with a *pang* of regret—always.

'He was unique among all the people that I have met in this also—that in every human situation he was by instinct perfectly Christian—unexpected often, but wonderfully sure and right in his touch compared with well-meaning blunderers such as the rest of us are. This was not merely because he was a gentleman of perfect breeding, but because at bottom he had a Christ-like sensibility of the mood, the mind and the need of the other person.'

The Master of the Temple:

'He was strangely lonely. He seemed to be always giving his heart to every one, but in reality I am sure that he wrestled alone with God, never finding complete fellowship in this world.'

Sheppard, quoted by Middleton Murry:

'Faith? I don't believe I know anything about Faith, Middleton. But Jesus is my *God*. I don't believe I have any faith except that: but I have a love for men; somewhere in me I have love. I *hang* on to that.'

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,
and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings
Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Professor Karl Barth has contributed a characteristic volume to the 'Challenge' series published by Messrs. James Clarke & Co. It is called *The Church and the Churches*, and certainly answers to the name of the series. There are four chapters in the book, and the subject is Church union or Church unity, and how it is to be achieved. 'Achieved' is perhaps not the right word; for union is not to be *made*. It is only to be *found*, since the only union or unity that is Christian is created by the Lord Himself. But it can be recognized and accepted by us on the right conditions. There is a good deal in the working out of this idea that is worth considering, for the argument is both brusque and challenging.

Dr. Barth deals first with the motives that raise the question of union. There is the dissipation of spiritual and material energies in mission work that arises from the fact that there is not one Church but many confronting the 'heathen.' What a hindrance to the hearing of the message, what a bewilderment to the hearers, what a burden to serious minds is the spectacle of Churches in conflict with one another, says Dr. Barth. Then again in the homeland the Church is confronted by all kinds of new creeds, all kinds of moral, social or political schemes for betterment, and, split up as it is into a multiplicity of bodies, the Church is unable to make good its claim to possess a loftier message than theirs. Further, the Church is hindered in its necessary duty of self-criticism and reform by the lack of a unison of will and direction, and in its influence over its own members when faith is set against faith in this array of various bodies.

But above all other motives that compel us to seek for the unity of the Church is the task from which the Church derives its existence. This task emerges immediately from the fact that the one and only Word of God has once for all been uttered, for all men to heed, in the fact of the Incarnation. The task from which the Church derives its being is to proclaim that this has really happened, and to summon men to believe in its reality. The task as thus committed contemplates no multiplicity of Churches. The unity of the Church is the acknowledgment that there is one Lord, one faith, one baptism. Mere 'unity' in itself is nothing. It is nothing but fallen human nature. It is a policy. It is idle and empty. The quest for the real unity of the Church is the quest for Jesus Christ as the concrete Head and Lord of the Church. Jesus Christ as the one Mediator between God and man *is* the oneness of the Church, is that unity within which there may be a multiplicity of gifts, of persons, while through it a multiplicity of Churches is excluded. We must not have 'unity' in our minds, we must have Him in our minds.

We are apt to justify the existence of separate Churches as manifesting the variety of views men hold, as exhibiting various aspects of truth. Or, again, as unfolding the wealth of that grace which is given to mankind in Jesus Christ. The Roman, the Greek, the Lutheran, the Reformed Churches are regarded as having their special attributes and functions within an imagined organic totality. But, however well this may sound, it is not theology, it is mere sociology or philosophy of history. And it has no recognition from the New Testament. In fact we have no right to explain the multiplicity of Churches at all. We have to deal with it as we deal with sin, to recognize it as a fact that has intruded itself, as guilt which we must take upon ourselves, without the power to liberate ourselves from it.

We would be doing a great deal for the unity of the Church if we would frankly recognize this. The only multiplicity that is Christian is that *within* the Church, namely, that of the local communities, of the gifts of the Spirit, of the believers of each sex, language, and race. It is unthinkable that to *those* multiplicities which are rooted in unity we should have to add that which tears it to pieces, unthinkable that great entire groups of communities should stand over against each other in such a way that their doctrines and confessions of faith are mutually contradictory, that what is called revelation in one place is called error in another, and that the ordinances of one group should be regarded as alien and unacceptable by another.

If Jesus Christ is the unity of the Church, then the union of the Churches is a mandate imposed by their Lord. But the fulfilment of this mandate is wholly the work of Him who lays it upon us. In Him the Church *is* one, and does not await any desires, capacities, or labours of ours for its unification. Yet we have a share in this, not by virtue of any Christian activity of ours, but in faith in Jesus Christ. Let us remember that the union of the Church is not mere tolerance or civility. The idea of tolerance is not Christian. It is political and philosophical, and is not only alien but even opposed to the gospel. And moreover it is fruitless so far as union is concerned. It has never succeeded in removing the old separations, or even affecting them. Nor is the idea of federation more hopeful or Christian. A mere federation, in itself, has nothing at all to do with real Church union. And we must say the same of the œcumenical movement. None of these expedients touches the real core of our problem. Church union is a *fact*. It cannot be manufactured, but must be found and confessed, in subordination to that already accomplished oneness of the Church which is in Jesus Christ. Let us not deceive ourselves. The union of the Churches would mean more than mutual respect or co-operation, more than understanding one another, more than common worship. It would mean a common faith, a union of the confessions into one unanimous confession.

The way to it is listening to Christ. But we must hear Christ within the particular leading of the Church to which we owe allegiance. Dr. Barth acknowledges that there is already a real oneness among people of diverse bodies, that there are real Christians to be found in all the Churches. And he points out that the unity of the Church will be realized as these people, in complete loyalty to their own Church, really listen to Christ 'in the terms of their own tradition and confession.' The Christ he means is not just any vague conception of the Lord but the Christ of those Scriptures which we all accept, the Christ in whom the sin of all men, their contradiction against God and their own inner self-contradiction, is done to death, taken away, forgiven, and exists no more. This is true Church unity, and only by the way of this faith will the Churches come to the oneness which is Christ Himself.

The greatest stress is laid in our time upon the social implications of the gospel, and there is a strong tendency, as there has always been, to identify the Kingdom of God with the dominant political theory of the day.

Now the dominant political theory of to-day runs in the direction of some form of collectivism. The system of individual ownership has fallen into disesteem, and it is generally taken for granted that by a process at once inevitable and right all ownership will be assumed and all men's activities will be controlled by the State. There are many earnest Christian preachers and teachers who appear to regard some transition of this sort as being pretty much equivalent to the coming of the Kingdom of God.

On the other hand, the public mind has been gravely alarmed and shocked by what it has seen of collectivism in actual practice, whether in its Fascist or its Bolshevist form. It spells tyranny, both political and religious, a tyranny more intensive and effective than the world has ever known. It may be argued, of course, that a democratic country, in gradually moving in the direction of collectivism, may safeguard itself against such tyranny, but there is a very real danger that some irretrievable step may be taken even by popular vote which would put the lives and fortunes of the people into the power of a bureaucracy or dictatorship which might play the tyrant when once it was firmly seated in the saddle. These possibilities, upon which the well-being of nations depends, cannot be too seriously pondered.

The whole subject has received fresh and vigorous treatment in a book from the pen of Mr. Walter Lippmann, the well-known American humanist and ethical writer. The title is *The Good Society* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net). It is a book which deserves to be read and considered by all interested in social and political reform to whatever school they belong. The writer says that twenty years of study and three years of writing have gone into his book. The War and the revolutions which followed it swept him off his feet intellectually, and only after years of mental struggle has he found firm ground again on which to stand. He is aware that his conclusion runs counter to the current stream of political thought, but he pulls a very strong oar. If his voice be as the voice of one crying in the wilderness, it is at least a very powerful voice and one that will assuredly be heard far and wide. It may even prove to be the herald of national salvation.

Mr. Lippmann begins with an appeal to history. He asks by what process has our modern civilization been evolved. Undoubtedly the answer of history is, by a process of liberation, by progressively freeing the individual from the bonds that fettered and enslaved him. The power of kings and lords was curtailed, monopolies and taxes which hindered the freedom of trade were abolished, and the rights of the common man to think his own thoughts and live his own life were asserted. The general aim of this long struggle was to give to every man free scope for his energies in a community of free men. It was a policy which was working towards a peaceful community of nations, each finding its own prosperity in the prosperity of its neighbours. Thus David Hume could write: 'I shall therefore venture to acknowledge that, not only as a man but as a British subject, I pray for the flourishing commerce of Germany, Spain, Italy, and even France itself.'

Now it seems that the nations have turned back from this road by which in past generations their liberties were won, and are now bent on putting their neck again under the yoke of authority. The State, instead of being the arbiter which by just laws holds the balance even between individuals and strives to maintain the utmost possible liberty for each, is now called upon to take into its own hands the management of everybody and every thing. And the hope is that under such State control the highest possible degree of wealth and well-being will be attained. Perhaps the chief underlying cause of this extraordinary *volte-face* is to be found in the decadence of the liberal spirit in the later nineteenth century, which with its doctrine of *laissez-faire* proved traitor to its own essential spirit and withdrew its hand from the plough while it had still a long furrow before it. It grew blind to the fact that it had still a mighty crusade before the liberty of every class and of every individual was achieved. So the mass of men, groaning under their disabilities, began to look elsewhere for their economic salvation.

But the way of collectivism leads to inevitable disillusionment. Mr. Lippmann makes a terrific attack upon it in all its forms. It is impracticable. The job of managing the whole life of a nation is too big for any man or group of men. It is vain to hope that a bureaucracy of supermen will somehow arise. The governors, whoever they may be, are but mortal men who may be tired, careless, prejudiced, ambitious, unscrupulous. A moment's reflection on the infinite complexity of a nation's life shows that the work of overhead planning is beyond human capacity. It could be done only by a rigid discipline of labour and a standardizing of the products of labour.

Collectivism, also, instead of enriching tends to impoverish. It can function only inside an enclosed area, for out in the open market its Five Years' Plans would be upset. Hence it involves 'the whole apparatus of a politically administered economy, the fixed prices and fixed wages, the sumptuary laws, the forced labour, the communized consumption, the directed production, not to speak of the censored and managed opinion in the totalitarian states, which is a reversion to the political technic which had to be rejected in order that the industrial revolution could take place.' For this reason it is in reality a 'war economy.' It tends to cultivate an intensely nationalist spirit; it builds barriers between the nations which curtail the freedom of trade; its discipline leaves no room for the dissenter and the conscientious objector; it turns the nation into an army. The social order resulting from it is as different from the social order envisaged in the gospel as the awkward squad under the sergeant-major is different from the family circle in a Christian home.

This leads to the ultimate objection to collectivism—that it does not respect human personality. It demands that the individual shall become an instrument of the State, and it is workable only when it can enforce this subjection. But man is inviolable because his personality is an end in itself, because, in Christian language, man has an immortal soul. This truth, which is vital to Christianity and to all spiritual religion, is the charter of the rights of man and sets a final limit to human interference. For this reason the true collectivist is hostile to religion, and hence we see the dictators attacking the Churches. 'They are well advised. They are not stupid men. They have appraised the religious life correctly when they have seen in it the source of the infection, or, as we should call it, the source of the inspiration, that makes men secure in their manhood, rejects the pretensions of their masters, invests the human personality with infinite dignity and untold promise. They have seen truly that the religious experience must for ever raise up new enemies of the totalitarian state. For in that experience the convictions which the dictators must crush are bred and continually renewed.'

A little volume has been recently published on *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net). It consists of four lectures by members of the staff of Wesley College, Headingley. The Biblical foundations of the doctrine, its history in the life and thought of the Church, and its theological implications are successively set forth in outline. Let us notice the contents of the second lecture, on 'The Spirit in the New Testament,' which is by the well-known Biblical scholar, Principal Vincent TAYLOR, D.D.

A notable feature in the New Testament is its witness to the strong consciousness of the first Christian believers of being under the power and direction of the Spirit of God. It is not too much to say that the New Testament Church is the community of the Spirit. The Spirit enters into the most intimate relationships with believers, teaching, guiding, inspiring, constraining, and so on. There is scarcely an aspect of Christian belief and character which is not in some way or other associated with the Spirit's presence and power. It is especially to be noticed that the fruits of the Spirit are ethical. The Spirit is 'Holy,' and His power is directed to the sanctification and enrichment of life.

As for the place of the doctrine of the Spirit in the message of Jesus, there is a very limited number of references to the Spirit in the Synoptic Gospels, not only on the part of Jesus but also on that of the Evangelists. The explanation lies in the principle which the form-critics are emphasizing, namely, that the preservation of both narratives and sayings in the oral period A.D. 30–60 was determined by the dominating interests and problems of the primitive Christian communities. And among these the doctrine of the Spirit is not to be numbered. The belief in the Spirit was a commonplace of Apostolic Christianity.

This is said on the assumption of the essential trustworthiness of the gospel tradition. But what if Bultmann and Branscomb are right in finding that the references to the Spirit in the message of Jesus are unauthentic, being products of the Christian community? How must we explain the rarity of the references then? The fact is that it is impossible on this critical theory to account for the rarity of the references, for it is impossible to say what prevented their wholesale introduction into the stream of the gospel tradition. Why, for example, does the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels not exhort His disciples to receive the Spirit, to be filled with the Spirit, to manifest the fruits of the Spirit?

It looks as though the historian is justified in refusing to find an unbridgeable gap between the teaching of Jesus and the faith of the Early Church, and the theologian may build with confidence on the tradition of Jesus' reported sayings.

In the Fourth Gospel the sayings of Jesus with reference to the Spirit are more numerous than those in the Synoptic Gospels. While it is impossible to claim that these sayings reproduce the exact words of Jesus, it is just as impossible to maintain that they are inventions of the Evangelist simply put into the lips of Jesus. Sometimes the Evangelist expresses original sayings of Jesus in another idiom, sometimes he expresses what he believes to be the mind of Christ. But we cannot identify the kind or class to which a specific saying belongs.

The real question, however, is whether the Johannine sayings express the mind of Christ, and we may confidently say that they do. It may be doubtful whether Jesus actually said that the Spirit comes from the Father, testifies of Christ, and leads men into the truth; but there is no doubt that such sayings give the teaching of Jesus as elucidated and expressed by a singularly discerning mind. The influence of the Christian community is to be found with far greater justice here than in the case of the Synoptic sayings.

So closely connected is the doctrine of the Spirit with the revelation made in Jesus Christ that it is natural to speak of the Spirit, the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Christ, and the Spirit of God without any intention of making exclusive distinctions. This is the foundation upon which Christian theology must ever build. And if we believe that Jesus is the Son of God, as the Gospels and the Epistles represent Him to be, and as faith and experience interpret Him, then the way is prepared 'for that long process of Christian inquiry and debate which finds its least inadequate expression in the historic doctrine of the Trinity.'

The Archbishop's 'Recall to Religion' has certainly caused in all the Churches a welcome stirring of the waters. It has at least made Christian men face the situation in all its seriousness and begin to seek earnestly for a remedy. And this of itself is good, and may be taken as a sign of the coming of better days.

Among other things it has been, partly at least, responsible for the publication by Canon Peter Green of an admirable little book for laymen entitled *The Christian Man* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). It may be taken as a companion volume to his Durham Lectures on 'The Man of God,' which were addressed to the clergy.

Desperate situations call for desperate remedies, and the religious situation to-day may well be regarded as desperate. At any rate, it is not a situation which can be met by any activity of the clergy alone. 'Nothing can save western civilization from complete collapse except a great return to God. Now in such a revival of religion the clergy must obviously play a great and important part. But it may well be doubted whether the part which the laity must play, if any results are to be attained, is not greater and more important.'

It is not merely that the clergy alone cannot possibly overtake the work, nor merely that as long as the laity are unaffected the work has obviously failed. There is more in it than that. So long as the clergy regard the laity, with the possible exception of office-bearers and church workers, as simply supplying a field for their activity, the Church must necessarily fail. 'The laity are not primarily a field in which the clergy can labour. They supply, or should supply, a field from which can be drawn active workers for Christ. Indeed the parson has failed unless he has helped his men to be, in all their work and in every relation in life, "labourers together with God." This is true alike for the sake of the men themselves, and for the sake of the Kingdom of God which needs their work.'

Now there is no such thing as a dual standard of Christian life and morals. The Church of Rome has countenanced a deep distinction between the properly 'religious' life, so called, and the secular, demanding from the various orders of its clergy a degree of consecration which, owing to the weakness of human nature, could not be expected from the common man. This error finds a ready acceptance in many minds throughout all the Churches. But apart from the reasonable expectation that the Christian minister should be more obviously devoting himself to Christian work, there is no ground for the idea that the clergy are to live on a higher spiritual level than the laity. 'The layman who supposes that he is justified in trying to serve God on a lower level of spirituality, and with less entire self-surrender, than he himself would deem necessary in a priest, deceives himself grievously. Holiness is required of a lay Christian no less than of a priest, and the idea that a lower standard of holiness will do in the one than in the other finds no support in Holy Scripture.' Not to the Twelve only, but to all His disciples, Jesus said, 'Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.' All Christians without distinction, whatever their worldly occupation or calling may be, are 'called to be saints.'

Misunderstanding must, of course, on this point be carefully guarded against. The word 'saint' has unfortunately lost its original meaning and fallen somewhat into contempt. But it simply means 'belonging to God,' or 'set apart for the service of God.' In this sense even inanimate things, like the vessels in the Temple, could be called holy. But, of course, in morally responsible beings set apart for the service of God there is required of necessity a certain moral character in accordance with the character of the God whom they serve.

What should be made clear is that this holiness or consecration to God is natural to man, that is to the true man that each of us ought to be, and every man's holiness should sit naturally upon him like a well-fitting garment. That holiness is natural to man in the deepest sense becomes evident when we reflect that man was created by God and is sustained by God for nothing less than this great end, that he should 'glorify God and enjoy Him for ever.' Holiness is to the soul what health is to the body. The Spirit of God is the life of the soul as the air we breathe is the life of the body. 'Holiness, healthiness of the spiritual side of man's being, means surrender to, and direction by, the Holy Spirit. That is what man was created for. And the man who is living apart from God, self-seeking and self-directed, is living an unnatural life, and is in what a doctor, if talking of the bodily state, would call a pathological or unhealthy condition. And that being so, holiness, true and real holiness, is possible for all; for boys and girls as much as for men and women, though of course the holiness of a lad or girl will be of a different kind, and show itself in different ways, from that of a man or woman in old age.'

The statement that holiness is natural to man needs to be qualified, or rather to be properly understood. Human nature has been so far perverted by sin that man is led by his evil desires to do many things which are really unnatural. There are many to-day who loudly claim that they are entitled to follow the desires of their own sinful hearts without restraint, and that to enlarge in every possible way the circle of their experiences is to live the more abundant life. They need to learn that there are promptings of passion which, instead of enriching life, impoverish and may even ruin it; that there are experiences which, so far from adding to the fullness of life, subtract from it, and may end by putting the final balance on the wrong side. We must therefore say to young people, in answer to their claim for full self-development and self-expression, 'You are right, absolutely right, to desire to develop all your powers and potentialities; to make the most of yourself. But the way to do so is not to throw the reins on the neck of your lower nature, but to set before you the ideal of true holiness. If we are right in believing that man is made to be in-dwelt and directed by God, then a life lived apart from God must always be a failure.'

Now there is a point at which all this must take its rise, and it is a point which must on no account be overlooked or passed in silence. 'Before anything can be perfected it must be begun, and the first step in holiness is that surrender to God, and acceptance of His Holy Spirit as Ruler and Guide, which we call conversion.' It may come in a single moment of strong decision, or it may be the fruit of a long process, a daily resistance of evil and choice of good. 'But whether as an instantaneous experience or as the result of innumerable acts of choice, one thing there must be, and that is a voluntary, distinct, and conscious acceptance of Christ as unquestioned Master, Saviour, and God. The weakness of the Church is that so many of her members have never made that choice at all.'

It is not possible here to indicate the wealth of wise Christian counsel which Canon GREEN gives to the layman for the culture of his spiritual life, the conduct of his business life, with all its special temptations and difficulties, and for his public service to the Kingdom of God. He calls for men who, in every walk of life, will be true to their colours and staunch to their Christian principles. 'When religion is discussed in the columns of the daily press we are often assured that there is a great deal more religion than the clergy think; that men are more religious at heart than they are willing to admit; and that men who make no profession of religion are often truer followers of Jesus Christ than the active members of church and chapel. If this is really true—and personally I think ninety per cent. of it is shocking nonsense—it would seem to be a very deplorable thing. I can forgive a man who is utterly indifferent to religion for doing nothing in God's service. I find no excuse for a man who is, or at least claims to be, truly religious and an earnest follower of Jesus Christ, who is too lazy or too timid to stick to his colours.'

Amid the cares of his business and the multitudinous activities of his daily life the layman must not forget the culture of his own soul. This is due to no spiritual selfishness, but to the obvious fact that no man can do good while he is not trying to *be* good. 'It is difficult to say whether the slogan, popular before the War with a certain school of writers, which ran, "Don't bother about saving your own dirty soul. Try and do some good in the world," was more silly than wicked, or more wicked than silly. Certainly it was supremely both of these things. It was like saying to a surgeon, "Don't bother about cleansing your own dirty hands. Get on with the operation." The only result would be that the patient would die of septic poisoning.' There is nothing better a man can do for his neighbour, his country, and the world than to seek holiness, for holiness is very infectious, and the people who do most good are the people to whom God is most real.

◆

Christianity in Action.

The Church and the Social Services.

By the Right Reverend A. A. David, D.D., Bishop of Liverpool.

There was a time when the statesman was responsible for keeping order and dispensing justice within his country, and for defending it from its enemies. Citizens paid their Government to do that for them, and not much more. But in modern times the State is no longer content to confine itself to the functions of the policeman, the lawyer, and the soldier. In all countries it has gradually enlarged its sphere of action. It has taken one department of human welfare after another into its controlling care. In some countries it claims now to embrace the whole of life. In Germany and Italy and Russia there is hardly anything a citizen can do for himself except with the permission or by the order of some official of the State. In Great Britain we shall never accept this totalitarian theory of government, however attractive its immediate achievements may be, because the love of liberty is in our blood. 'Britons never will be slaves,' even to their own freely elected Government. Nevertheless, we have to recognize that even Britons are in many respects not quite so free as they were. We have submitted to interference by the State in matters which the politician of the past would never have dared to touch at all.

What have we lost by this public invasion into what used to be regarded as private concerns? There are some who declare that it has not only threatened our essential liberty, but has also weakened our sense of responsibility. A man says, 'If the State will educate my children, will help me to feed them, will look after me when I am ill, will keep me going somehow if I lose my job, will give me a pension when I am sixty-five, then I have by so much the less need to provide these things for myself and for my family. I need not "look forward."' And if he can say that, his independence of character, his whole moral fibre, is in danger of being weakened. But there need be little apprehension in this regard. After all, however much is done for people, there will always remain incentive enough for them to do more for themselves. And the provision now made for the poorer citizen enables him to provide further for himself. Moreover, we have to recognize that all these changes are themselves due to a new sense of responsibility, not for ourselves, but for our neighbours. When we of this generation pay our taxes and our rates, we know that we are enabling the country, or the city, to do for the needy what could never have been done for them anywhere in any previous century. And what does this mean? In the simple language of the gospel it means that the love of our neighbour has made its way into the law of the land. If ever we are asked what Christianity has done for the world, may we not for one of our answers point to the achievement of the social services? In them we have seen God at work.

Here, then, is a change in our national life which has come upon us by almost universal agreement, and, as it were, so inevitably that we are apt to overlook all that it involves for the Churches and their work. It is well, therefore, that we should face this new situation squarely, and consider how we can best adjust ourselves to it, and what new opportunities it offers us. At first sight the increased and increasing claims of the State upon social, and therefore upon individual life, seems to imply a shrinkage of the field of activity hitherto open to the Church. In the old days, when the relief of all kinds of distress was almost entirely the concern of private benevolence, how was it effected? Individuals discerned here and there a need of one kind and another which they felt impelled to meet. So they formed themselves into voluntary societies and set to work to do what they could. May we not claim that they acted under the inspiration, direct or indirect, of the Church? In those days it was the Church that took the initiative in teaching the children, in building schools, in founding hospitals, and innumerable other institutions designed to alleviate poverty, ignorance, and distress. Again, it was the Church that sent its agents into our Police Courts, bringing with them Christian help and guidance to offenders against the law. Out of that work has grown the whole of our great probationary system, and it is much to be desired that the Church should still take a share in this work by providing voluntary helpers in the after-care of young delinquents.

It would be easy to quote other examples in which groups of individuals have done their best on a very small scale to make the lives of the poor a little less hard and a little more secure. And they have done it so well that the State has followed their examples upon an immensely larger scale, and in many respects with far greater efficiency. Does this mean that the Church is being squeezed out of the sphere of practical benevolence? May it now relegate these good works to a Government which has taken so definite a responsibility for them, and confine itself wholly to what is after all its primary task of drawing men into its own body, and there preparing character for service? Such a prospect need not be considered. For, in the first place, there will always be room for new enterprises and adventures of Christian love, and for these the initiative must still come from the Christian Church. Christ's followers must ever be asking themselves what *more* He would have us wisely do for His poor. The Church must continue its work of stimulating and inspiring State benevolence, and of pointing the way to fuller and more far-seeing applications of love for our neighbours. But, in the second place, there are new and rich opportunities opening before us out of social legislation as it exists to-day. They are waiting for our foresight to discern and our courage to use them.

The first great extension in England of State concern in the social life of the people was in the sphere of education. In 1870 the Government took over responsibility for the instruction and, to some limited extent, for the training of the children. It began to build schools and to maintain them out of public funds. And that public service has been developed ever since, till now a large and increasing number of elementary and secondary schools are provided and maintained by the State, and very considerable assistance is given in grants to schools and universities by local authorities and by the Government. This at once suggests the question whether in these new conditions it is wise to continue a policy designed to meet the old ones. I have myself no doubt that it is not wise. Up till 1870 the Church of England was right to build and administer schools. There was no one else to do it. The Church did so with such success that the State was impelled by our example to assume this responsibility as a public duty. How shall we take our proper share in that public responsibility? First, as I think, by maintaining the schools we own, as examples, still needed, of what elementary schools should be and do, and making these in all respects as well provided and equipped as Council schools. But it is not part of our proper share to compete with the State any further by the provision of new schools. We desire to be partners with central and local authorities, and not their rivals; and we ought to leave to them that part of the work which they can do far better than we can. What then remains for us in the sphere of education as it surrounds us to-day? I hold that there is a great range of opportunity which we ought resolutely to explore in the wider setting I have tried to describe. In the educational field I have only time to indicate one of our chances, to my mind the most important of them all, namely, the care of those who teach in Church or Council schools. Let us press on their behalf for a longer period of training. Two years in a Training College is not enough. In our own colleges let us secure that this training shall offer them the best and wisest religious influence we can provide. Let us be bolder in suggesting to them that the vocation of a Christian teacher calls for a real and complete dedication of mind and spirit. In the State Training Colleges and the University departments, and also in our secondary schools, let us see that opportunities shall be offered to students at least to prepare themselves to teach the Bible. There we can count upon the willing, I would say even the eager, co-operation of the Free Churches. I believe also that State authorities, both central and local, are more than ready to accept our suggestions and even to help us in this matter, provided that our approach to them is based upon our common Christianity and can be kept free from any suspicion of sectarian claims. Again, we have as a Church a duty to the teacher in his school. He needs our help, and he wants it, as is nearly always shown by the response to our offer of lectures, refresher courses, and discussion groups, by which he may enrich his own spiritual life, and exercise a stronger Christian influence in his work. He ought, moreover, to be protected against the poison of secularist literature. There are books which fall into his hands subtly designed to undermine his faith. They can easily be answered. Ought not the Church to be watchful and alert in counteracting this kind of false and subversive propaganda? There are many other means open to us of securing that teachers shall have at least their full chance of becoming, in knowledge and in life, what they must be if they are to train our children to be members of a Christian country and a Christian Church. And, after all, it is not through buildings or systems but through persons that they will so be prepared. I have written of Church and State as partners in educational service from an English point of view. In Scotland this co-operation has become happier and more settled than ours, and many of us wish that we could attain a similar partnership south of the Border on similar lines. For various reasons, some of them historical, this seems at present out of our reach. In this country we have problems of religious education to solve which are special to ourselves. But we shall approach them with a larger wisdom and with new hope in the wider setting I am attempting to describe.

From the State's concern in teaching I return to its work in alleviating economic distress and insecurity. Since 1906 social legislation of this kind has come upon us with a rush. We have had Acts of Parliament dealing with insurance against sickness and unemployment, with the provision of houses, with relief of distress, with medical treatment, with the maintenance of health, with pensions. And now we are to receive State aid in providing our leisure hours with wholesome recreation through clubs and community centres. For these purposes vast administrative systems have been set up and very complicated machinery has been devised. This is entirely necessary where the State has to provide for great multitudes and varieties of people. And it is inevitable that these operations should in the main be wholesale, mechanistic, impersonal. I am not one of those who are quick to complain of the evils of bureaucracy and officialdom. I know too well that they exist. But when we consider fairly the difficulties that confront our Civil Servants, we ought, I think, to be thankful that in this country, and both in London and in our municipalities, they are in their work as human and sympathetic as we know them to be. Nevertheless, if this State benevolence is to be conveyed to the individual in a Christian spirit, there is need of something more than the administration of a law. And that has been recognized. In nearly every Social Service Act there is provision for a voluntary advisory body. The State relies upon the assistance, the counsel, the experience of individual social workers. It gives a share in public administration to the subtle and invaluable influence of personal service, and, so far as I can ascertain, ours is the only country in which this policy has been deliberately adopted.

Here, then, is a clear call to the Church which we dare not neglect. 'I am among you,' said our Lord, 'as he that serveth.' Now that the State is itself a servant of the Royal Law, ought we not to be producing men and women prepared to share with it that service? As members of the Church which is His Body they should be growing into just that type of personality—observant, keen, unselfish, humble—which He needs for work both within it and outside. May not the State rightly expect that the Church, nurturing such personalities, should send them out for service in the world? We have seen how Christian principles have won their way into secular spheres. To that extent the gospel has already permeated public life. Ought not the Church to follow up that achievement by a stronger leavening still? Let the clergy make it a part of their teaching to encourage and inspire laymen to grasp this opportunity of Christian service whenever it comes within their reach as members of district and borough councils, of advisory committees, of community councils, or of one or other of those voluntary social service organizations which are handmaids of the State and partners in State enterprises. Most of them have a gift for some constructive work if not for leadership, though in many it is latent, waiting for its chance. If they are conscious of any such capacity, let them seek their opportunities first in the parish. But let them not be content with Christian service that is spent wholly within the family life of the Church, and never goes beyond it. Their opportunities outside are multiplying year by year.

Within the last few months a new set of chances have emerged into special importance. They arise out of the latest venture of the Ministries of Health and Education. It is much more than an encouragement of Physical Training. To establish its full purpose there will be need of the co-operation of a large number of existing clubs and other voluntary associations and of some new ones. Community Centres are springing up not in new districts only but everywhere, to be homes of all manner of healthful activities and of fellowship life. These new institutions will of course offer membership to individuals, or, as at the Peckham Health Centre, to families. But they will serve a still higher purpose if they also provide a common shelter for clubs or other social units, each preserving its distinctive character and bringing its own separate contribution into the life of the whole. Thus might a Centre become a *communitas communitatum*. But as such it will be incomplete if local Church 'communities' remain outside. What prospect is there that they will throw their influence into this development? Here we have to reckon with a serious obstacle to co-operation between social agencies of the Church and those others that stand outside all religious adherence. They regard each other with mutual suspicion. The former, using culture and recreation as means to spiritual ends, are naturally apprehensive of activities which seem to concentrate on the welfare of the body and the mind with no regard for the health of the spirit. Their concern is with the whole personality, and they feel at a disadvantage when they have to meet competing attractions offered by others who care for only a part of it. This helps to explain the reserved and negative attitude once very common among churchmen towards any welfare movement to which the word 'secular' can be applied. Thus, when Women's Institutes began to be established in English villages, many of the clergy stood aloof from them as irrelevant, and even potentially hostile, to religion. The 'secular' organizations on their part are equally suspicious of the Church. They resent the inference that because they are 'undenominational' therefore they are against religion, or even that they take no account of it. Many of them would declare that they must wear that label, not because they are careless of spiritual interests, but because they are afraid of sectarian discord, and because, working for members of all Churches, they cannot afford to be dominated by any one of them.

Recently, however, hopeful signs have appeared from both directions. Among Church people there is a growing recognition that a true line of Christian advance lies in the permeation of all social effort by the spiritual influence which it is the peculiar function of the Churches to exert both within their borders and outside. It is not denied that this influence must begin its work in self-contained and homogeneous groups looking to the Church for religious teaching and worship, and also for opportunities of social intercourse in which learners and worshippers may become friends. Otherwise the Church cannot build up a secure and continuous family life of its own. But it is realized that such exclusive groups may safely seek at least some of their social activities in a more comprehensive sphere, where they may be trusted to bring a spiritual influence of their own. Suppose, for instance, a Church club for young men, housed as one of many others in a Community Centre, and taking its share of advantages offered in common to all. No doubt its members might be tempted to lower standards, a risk to which they must in any case be constantly exposed. But if they are well grounded and well led, might not this club help to raise the spiritual level of the community life surrounding it? This is one of the considerations which is likely to ensure a warmer welcome from the Church for movements in which the State is helping the people to build up a richer cultural and spiritual life for themselves.

We must also take account of another encouraging sign of the times. There is to-day a widespread revival of interest among lay-folk in a spiritual or Christian approach to life. In 'secular' clubs and other organizations, as also in factories, a hearing is readily given to any one who will deal with this approach, provided that he speaks in the name, not of one of the separated Churches, but of Christ Himself. This new interest is reflected among those who are centrally responsible for the administration of the Physical Training Act. There is ample evidence of their desire that the whole movement shall not only secure the support of the Churches, but also be itself pervaded by the religious spirit and directed towards spiritual as well as bodily health. It is even likely that grants of money will be made to Church organizations which can show that they are managed with reasonable efficiency. And a far-sighted leader of this public enterprise, not himself a Churchman, goes so far as to say, 'If I did not believe that this movement is essentially religious, I could take no interest and I should see no hope in it.'

We have reviewed a new set of opportunities open to the Church. How can we grasp them by meeting the State in its tentative approaches? Only by enlisting the voluntary service of lay-men and women of all ages, who have been taught that the love they owe to God may be paid to their neighbours, and are prepared to learn by further study and training how this may be done. Upon them it depends whether the Church is to rest content with methods of Christian work appropriate enough to the social conditions of the last century, but inadequate to the environment of to-day; or is to grow into its new responsibilities, and by so doing to extend and strengthen its influence upon the national life.

Old Texts in Modern Translations.

Jeremiah xlv. 4, 5 (McFadyen).

By Principal H. Wheeler Robinson, D.D., Oxford.

'When *I* must destroy what I built, and when *I* must uproot what I planted, shalt *thou* seek great things for thyself?' That is a question which life puts to all of us, sooner or later. But there are two other questions which usually lead up to it. The first is, 'What do you want?'—the question which challenges us as we stand on the threshold of responsible life. We choose a career, or drift into one. We enter on a friendship which may shape all our life. We begin to create the world of personal interests in which our chief recreation will be found. It seems as if a really adequate answer would require the knowledge drawn from a full experience of life. How can we tell what anything really is until we have tried it? We stand like travellers at the parting of many untried ways, where to choose one is to reject the others, and to which there can be no retracing of our steps. Really to know what we want of life is no mean portion of life's wisdom. It was a pardonable exaggeration of Carlyle's to say, 'Blessed is he who has found his work; let him ask no other blessing.'

Close on the heels of that first question, 'What do you want?' comes the second, 'What will you pay for it?' Again, it seems an unfair question. How can any of us foresee just how much effort in muscle or brain it will cost him to reach the chosen goal of his journey? Nobody knows what any particular experience will cost him until he has gone through it. We must go on paying for what we wanted, farthing by farthing, day by day. Each man learns the cost to himself—rich man, poor man, beggar-man, thief, the butcher, the baker, the candlestick-maker. If any one of them cries, 'I don't want to be this, I want to be something else,' life is ready with the question in a new form, and retorts, 'Then what *do* you want to be, and how much will you pay to change over?' Most things are possible—even to be a saint—if we want them enough, and are ready to pay the inevitable price for them.

The third question is really that of the text: 'What do you want it *for*?' It usually lags behind the others, and is sometimes sprung upon a man in his middle-age, when he has largely attained his ambition, made his reputation, gathered his money. 'What will you do with it, now that you have got it? What was the secret motive all the time inspiring your energies, which now has the opportunity to display itself?' This is the most difficult of the three questions to answer, because it deals with the subtle pressures, the half-conscious instincts, the dim desires, which we have never dragged into the light for self-judgment. How hard it is to be sure that we have ever done anything with entire unselfishness! How easily a man may go on persuading himself that he is inspired by high and honourable motives, by the desire to serve others, to make a genuine contribution to the world's welfare, to advance knowledge, to obey God—until he reaches a point at which the subtle tinge of selfishness, the corruption of a mean, cowardly, tyrannical or sensual spirit is revealed to others or even to himself! That revelation may come through success, when a man no longer needs to pretend. But it may also come through failure, disillusionment, the embitterment of spirit that at last knows itself for what it is.

The question of the text was addressed to Baruch, the secretary of Jeremiah. He had answered the first two questions successfully. He had encountered one of the world's really great men, the finest of the Old Testament prophets, the large-hearted, tender-souled Jeremiah. Baruch's own heart had gone out in passionate discipleship to him, for here surely was a man to love, and a man to follow. When Baruch met Jeremiah, he knew what he wanted. Not less was he ready for the second question, ready to pay the price of such discipleship in isolation, hatred, peril of life. He does not seem ever to have flinched whilst Jeremiah and he stood alone against a whole people. It was worth while to be the friend and companion of such a man as the prophet, and to feel sure of being on the side of God. But now came the third question, the acid test of the alloy of selfishness. It came through apparent failure. To see no result for all your work, to believe that it will all be thrown away—how hard it is to go on working still, for the work's sake! For Baruch, the sorrow of this personal grief was mingled with sympathy with his country's fate: 'Woe is me now: for Jehovah hath added sorrow to my pain; I am weary with my groaning, and I find no rest.'

To such a man comes the divine message, through the prophet's lips. The point of it lies in the contrast between the unshrinking spirit of God and the shrinking spirit of Baruch, yet beneath the contrast there is God's greatest gift, an offered fellowship. 'When *I* must destroy what I built, and when *I* must uproot what I planted, shalt *thou* seek great things for thyself?' It is the emphasis of the new translation which brings out this point. God has lavished His care on a people whose national existence He is now compelled to destroy. God is about to overthrow the very building His own hands have built through many centuries. God will uproot the very trees His own hands once planted. In Christian terms, the prophet's message gives a glimpse of the Cross of Christ in the heart of God, the eternal passion of self-sacrifice that is God's very nature, 'the authentic sign and seal of Godship.' To this sorrowful human heart, God Himself says, 'Behold, and see if there be any sorrow like mine . . . can you not forget your own demands, your little self, as I show you my heart of sorrow?' That is the greatest of all comfort, for it is the lifting up of a man's thought and vision to something far greater than himself, to a purpose of far-reaching horizon, to an interpretation of the universe in which his private trouble falls into its true place and finds its true comfort. The realization that there is self-sacrifice at the very heart of God gives strength, motive, vision, and, above all, the companionship of Spirit with spirit, in what would else have been a lonely world.

The spirit of the Cross is a *spirit*, and not a formula. 'To become stereotyped,' it has been said, 'is to fail in life.' The social tradition, which hands on to each of us the acquisitions and achievements of the past, easily becomes a tyranny to which we are slaves. So it is that, to the eyes of youth, middle-age often seems to be built on a foundation of prudential compromises and tame expediences—and youth is not always wrong. To live by a spirit is much more difficult and sometimes more dangerous than to conform our lives to a set of maxims, a code of rules. But this tame surrender to circumstance and to public opinion is again and again challenged by the essential Christian emphasis on the spirit of the Cross. The Christian is always in need of the Apostolic warning that life cannot be reduced to a set of petty rules—'Touch not, taste not, handle not.' On the other hand, the spirit of self-denial ranges from the mere courtesies of everyday intercourse up to the great heroisms. Think of Jesus in the Pharisee's house, watching with half-humorous pity the unseemly jostling for the best seats. His little parable of good manners—'when thou art bidden, go and sit down in the lowest place'—is not simply a contribution to a Palestinian book of social 'Don'ts'; it is the application of the spirit of the Cross to the little things of life. There is no finality in such a spirit. We do not exhaust its meaning in some choice of a vocation once for all, like that of the monk or the missionary. Those who make a worthy choice at the outset find that the ideal of it continually expands, and makes ever new demands upon them. There is a fine, though simple enough, example of this in the Labrador experience of Wilfred Grenfell. He tells us how his work as a medical missionary had brought him to a home where the mother lay dead and the father dying. Next day, he had to improvise a double funeral, and then found himself, as he says, with five little mortals sitting on the grave-mound. 'We thought we had done all that could be expected of a doctor, but we now found the difference. *It looked as if God expected more.*' So Grenfell had to establish his Children's Home. That is the essential quality of the spirit of the Cross. God expects more, and both the glory and the rebuke of the Christian ideal spring from that divine expectation. To face that continued demand is one of the most real difficulties of the Christian conscience. Where am I to draw the line between legitimate personal comfort, honourable ambition, a respectable standard of Christian living, on the one side, and on the other, the sternly haunting word, 'Seekest *thou* great things for thyself?' If I do draw such a line, God's finger wipes it out.

The spirit of the Cross, then, is the characteristic spirit of Christianity. Just because it is not a formula or a code of rules but a distinctive attitude to life, it gives to the religion of the Cross its unique character. There is no other religion like this so free from the spirit of a bargain, at least wherever the characteristic spirit of the New Testament religion is maintained. God comes to man in the Cross of Jesus Christ, not in the first place demanding obedience, but offering Himself to us as the self-sacrificing God. There is no other religion which does not insist on certain acts of obedience, ritual or moral, before man can approach God and be sure of welcome. But the spirit of the Cross, so amply illustrated in the words and works of Jesus, means that God does not wait for man to qualify himself for approach to God. God takes the initiative and approaches man. God wins man to a voluntary and far more complete obedience by the graciousness and grace of His own previous approach to man.

This is the genuine spirit of the Church of Christ. Underneath all the differences of the successive generations and nationalities, all the peculiarities of organization and utterance and even conduct, we could find no more universal and characteristic feature of the genuine tradition of our faith than that of the spirit of the Cross. Whether we think of the message or of the method, of the religion or of the morality, it is this note of self-sacrifice, divine and human, this acceptance of suffering for the sake of the divine purpose, which makes the true Church one. The supreme sacrament of the Church is the sacrament of apparent failure, for in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper we proclaim, we 'preach,' the Cross of Christ, the Cross which was failure before it could be success. The history of the Church may often show the lamentable absence even of the ideal, but also shows its continual re-emergence and frequent realization. The spirit of the Cross is not confined to the visible Church, and some of its finest examples lie beyond the borders of any organization. Yet it is the Church which best nurtures that spirit in ordinary men and women. It is the Church as the fellowship of that spirit which preserves and hands on the great tradition of it, and in this sign alone can conquer. The fellowship of the Church is built on what has truly been called that right of the weaker over the stronger which is part of the moral structure of the universe. It is built on the principle enunciated by a notable French writer, 'Nothing is lost when we make an offering of it.'

Such a fellowship of men, by its very nature, proclaims that fellowship with God on which it depends for very existence. All human sympathy, all social consciousness, all generous service, spring from a human nature which God has created in His own image. They belong to man as truly as the self-seeking instincts, with which they are so often in conflict. But, because of this conflict, they need the constant reinforcement of the fellowship of God, in whom there is no such conflict, since it is of His very self to give Himself. Morality always needs, indeed always implies, some sort of religion. Life is ultimately a lonely business, and loneliest as it moves upwards. But that upward path, at every step, brings a clearer vision of Him who so loved that He gave, Him for whom living is giving. Morality at its highest, in the spirit of the Cross, must always mean, like mysticism, an 'alone with the Alone.'

This is not the place to argue in what sense God can be said to suffer. It is enough to say that the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Christ we see on the Cross, is One who carries the whole burden of the universe, One who does not stand aloof from it but enters into it, One who is not Himself unmoved by the cry of the whole creation groaning and travailing in pain until now. In some deep sense it must be true that the Cross of Christ is the age-long Cross of God Himself, whilst sinning and suffering man works out his troubled course and attains his destiny. It must be true, for there is no solution to the problem of human suffering, save in the divine. This is the clear teaching of the Bible, in the Old Testament as well as in the New. We have been listening to a prophet comforting his disciple by the thought of a fellowship with God in suffering. This is the essence of the gospel. God's love shrinks from no sacrifice that it may save to the uttermost. The spirit of that divine sacrifice can animate every honourable career, and consecrate every worthy ambition, but it is also the secret of that inner peace for which every human heart seeks, the peace which Jesus offered on His Cross. I shall always remember one night in an Austrian village. I had been tramping all day with a very intimate friend, but before we went to bed we walked out of the village late at night and stood on the little bridge over its stream. The village was asleep; all around us, in the moonlight, were the everlasting hills, crowned with their snows. In that majestic stillness we seemed to have come as close to peace as any mortal could, and one of us said so. Then we happened to glance at the structure of the bridge. There, just above our heads, clear in the moonlight, though unnoticed before, was a crucifix. The face of the Sufferer, looking down upon us, seemed to say, 'O foolish men, to think that solitude is peace. This is my peace, the peace I won on the Cross, and give you from my Cross.'

◆

Literature.

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

The translation of the massive work of Johannes Weiss, *Das Urchistentum*, is a great achievement for which all New Testament scholars will be deeply grateful to the publishers, and to Dr. F. C. Grant and his three colleagues at the Seabury-Western Theological Seminary. The translation is published in two handsome volumes under the title, *The History of Primitive Christianity* (Macmillan; 42s. net). Considerable as it is, this work is only the first half of what was to be the *magnum opus* of Johannes Weiss. The second part, alas! 'Jesus and Early Christianity,' was never written, for in August, 1914, death cut short the author's brilliant career in his fifty-first year. Book I. of *The History of Primitive Christianity*, which treats the theme of 'The Primitive Community,' is translated by the editor. Book II., 'The Gentile Mission and Paul the Missionary,' is translated by Dr. A. H. Forster; Book III., 'Paul the Christian and Theologian,' by Dr. P. S. Kramer; and Books IV. and V., 'The Missionary Congregations and the Beginnings of the Church,' and 'The Separate Areas,' by Dr. S. E. Johnson. The last three chapters of Book V., which trace the expansion of early Christianity in Asia Minor, Macedonia and Achaia, and Rome, it should be recalled, were not written by Weiss himself, but were supplied after his death by his friend, the late Professor Rudolf Knopf, of Bonn.

It will be seen from this summary description how large a canvas Weiss had prepared for his masterpiece. There is indeed no other word by which to describe it. Although the work, as it exists, is unfinished, enough remains to show how great an undertaking it was, and it is evident that his earlier works, and, in particular, 'The Earliest Gospel' (1903), 'The Revelation of St. John' (1904), 'The Writings of the New Testament' (1905), and, above all, his fine 'Commentary' on 1 Corinthians (in Meyer's series, 1910), prepared the way for it.

Much the greater part of *The History of Primitive Christianity* is a detailed study of the work and writings of St. Paul, and it is in this masterly treatment that perhaps the chief value of the book lies. Paul, as Weiss sees him, is a vital personality, with a rich and living experience of Christ. Full justice is done to the Apostle's creative work, but Weiss has a much truer conception of the earliest Christianity than to present him as one who transformed the new faith, by the aid of contemporary Hellenistic conceptions, and so made it something which it had never been before. By the aid of a careful analysis of the Acts and of the sayings of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels, he shows that many elements which are often included under the term 'Paulinism' were, in reality, part of the common tradition of the first communities. In this connexion his treatment of the Messiahship of Jesus, the Resurrection, the use of the title 'Lord,' and Churches of Jerusalem and of Antioch, are of the greatest interest and importance. The use Weiss makes of the sayings of Jesus reveals the extent to which he was a precursor of Form-Criticism, and it is interesting to speculate how he would have estimated its more sceptical developments. Such a passage as the following is suggestive, and it has the advantage of revealing the clarity and forcefulness of his style. 'Every narrative that has been preserved, every saying that has survived, is evidence of some particular interest on the part of this primitive church. To this extent the selection of what was handed down serves to characterize the group whose interest it satisfied. The surviving tradition thus reflects, as in a mirror, the standards this earlier church set itself, the hopes it entertained, the conceptions it held of the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, of Jesus as Messiah and Son of Man, of the future of Israel, and of the events which were to precede the end of the age. . . . In far greater measure must we learn to read the Gospels not only for what they tell us about Jesus, but also for what we can learn from them about the life and the faith of the earliest Christians' (i. 12 f.).

In addition to the abundant information which it contains, the entire work abounds in fruitful and stimulating suggestions. Again and again, the reader is provoked to ponder. For example, it is open to serious question whether the 'vision-theory' which Weiss sets forth is sufficient to account for the Resurrection faith, and whether he has provided an adequate foundation for the story of Christianity when he bids us steadily take into account 'the continuing influence of the personality of Jesus, so strong, and so sure of Himself.' It is in points such as these that one wonders how Weiss would have written, if he had been able to attack his projected work on Jesus and primitive Christianity.

A very practical question ought to be mentioned. Is the ordinary reader justified in purchasing so expensive a work? The answer is simple. If he means merely to skim these eight hundred and seventy pages, No; but if he desires to spend profitable weeks in a patient study of this great work, he will not regret the outlay of two guineas.

THE CAMBRIDGE PLATONISTS.

Somehow a certain romantic interest attaches to the group of religious thinkers who flourished at Cambridge in and after the middle of the seventeenth century, known to history as the Cambridge Platonists. Dean Inge among recent writers has done much to foster the interest in them, expounding their thought in the context of Christian mysticism. But there is room enough for further discussions and expositions of their thought, and for that reason we welcome the recent volume by Professor W. C. de Pauley, D.D., of the University of Toronto, entitled *The Candle of the Lord* (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d. net). This is the twenty-eighth volume of the series published by the S.P.C.K. for the Church Historical Society.

The most famous names among the Cambridge Platonists are Benjamin Whichcote, John Smith, Ralph Cudworth, and Henry More. If the first-named was the originator of the School or Movement, the others appear to have engaged in a deeper philosophical effort, vindicating as against materialism or naturalism the spiritual nature of reality. In these studies all four thinkers are considered. In addition there are studies of Richard Cumberland, who has been described as rather 'a Cambridge Zenonian or Ciceronian' than a Cambridge Platonist; Nathaniel Culverwel, who has been described as rather 'a Christian Aristotelian' than a Christian Platonist; George Rust, a disciple of Henry More; and Edward Stillingfleet, who is not usually included in the group, but who 'takes us back to the candle of the Lord as it was lighted first in Adam.'

For comparison and contrast there are also elaborate references in this volume to the thought of Jeremy Taylor and John Calvin.

It is not a volume to be consulted in a hurry. Dr. de Pauley does not condescend to any introductory remarks on the place of the Cambridge Platonists in the religious thought of the seventeenth century in England. Nor does he preface his expositions with notes on the individual thinker of whose views he is about to treat. He plunges *in medias res*. The result is a volume not so much for the beginner as for the more advanced reader, who is already familiar with the background and general content of the teaching of the Cambridge Platonists. Such a reader will value in particular the careful documentation of this learned and scholarly work.

THE WAILING WALL.

The Wailing Wall, by Miss Olga Levertoff (Mowbray; 3s. 6d.), is a brave and a beautiful book. Miss Levertoff is a Christian who has not ceased to be a Jewess; she feels, indeed, that she is the more truly Jewish for being Christian. She cannot define Judaism, all the familiar tests of nationality fail; to her it is something fundamental and baffling analysis, and certainly it is quite consistent with earnest Christian faith and deep Christian experience. Her very language breathes the rich fragrance of the Eastern soul, and her style (not always, by the way, easy to read without close concentration) might almost be called in places Deuteronomic English.

Like Wasserman, whom she frequently quotes in her earlier chapters, Miss Levertoff feels intensely the tragedy of her people's history, revived afresh by the persecutions of recent years. As she sees it, the supreme crisis was the great rejection of the Messiah. In Jesus, Jewry might have found and may—nay will—yet find the consummation of its own spiritual development. But her attitude is not one of judicial condemnation, it is that profound sympathy which identifies itself with the sorrow and the sin of a deeply loved people. Were Hosea alive to-day, we feel, he would speak in tones like these. We are impelled to the conviction that Israel has indeed 'received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins.' Yet her return to her true inheritance is possible only through the acceptance of Jesus as the Messiah, the crown and hope of Jewish nationality. There is a suggestion of *Holy Cross Day* about the book, but it is tender where Browning's Rabbi is pardonably bitter. Like her distinguished father, Miss Levertoff could echo the words of that other Paul of old, and take as her motto the opening words of Romans 9 and 10.

But how is the ideal to be achieved? How is this nation, with its strong sense of superiority, and its rankling sense of the contempt with which the Gentile-Christian worlds regard it, to be brought to the foot of the Cross? Not by absorption in a materialistic world which may unify Jew and Gentile on a common basis of irreligion, nor by a Zionism which but seeks to add another to the kingdoms of the world, can the goal be won. Nor is it even by the proclamation of Christian truth; 'missions' are in their place among races which have no contact with Christianity, but the Jew lives among the followers of Jesus, and will form his judgment acutely on their practical standard of life, not on their theology or even on the saintliness of the few. Least of all can the task be accomplished by persecution, by dragging the children of the Ghetto 'by the head and hair, and against their obstinate hearts, to partake of the heavenly grace.' In the last resort the only method is the permeation of the social order, in which the Jew now lives as an alien, with the spirit of Jesus the Jew. In the meantime something may be done by making it clear that even in its forms of worship the Church has room for the Jewish spirit, and not the least moving chapter in Miss Levertoff's work is the last, where she gives an account of the Jewish-Christian Eucharist as celebrated by men like her father. A brave and a beautiful book.

THE SPEAKER'S BIBLE.

The second volume of *The Epistle to the Romans* in *The Speaker's Bible*, edited by the Reverend Edward Hastings, M.A., has just been issued. The volume begins with a sermon on Ro 12[1] and continues to the end of the Epistle. There are some arresting topic studies also—Dr. A. Herbert Gray writing on 'Thank-Offerings to God,' Dr. J. H. Morrison on 'Christian Conscience and the Civil Government,' the Rev. J. S. Stewart on 'The Triumphant Adequacy of Jesus,' the Rev. R. Bethune on 'The Possessive Attitude,' and Dr. F. J. Rae on 'Tertius, Paul's Secretary.'

A point which strikes one specially in this volume is the very wide range of illustrative matter.

The volume includes also an excellent subject index to volumes xix.–xxviii. With the two previous indexes, which appeared in volumes ix. and xviii., this now forms a complete index to all the volumes which have been published up to date. No pains have been spared in this index to make all the material easily accessible, so that any one wishing to write on any particular aspect of a subject will be able with ease to read it up here.

Probably any one who has not already got the first volume on the Epistle to the Romans will wish to have it also. There we have the valuable Introduction written by Principal Vincent Taylor, where he discusses the Contents of the Epistle, the Purpose, the Date, the Genuineness, the Readers, the Unity, and the Leading Ideas of the Epistle, as well as the Destination of chapter 16[1-23].

While *The Speaker's Bible* is primarily intended to be a stimulus to the working minister it is also much used for devotional reading.

Romans, Volume II., may be obtained from all booksellers or direct from the publishers, The Speaker's Bible Office, Aberdeen, at the price of 9s. 6d. net. The publishers will be glad to send a prospectus of the earlier volumes and to supply these.

ONE OF BECKET'S BISHOPS.

Bartholomew of Exeter: Bishop and Canonist (Cambridge University Press; 21s. net.), by Dom Adrian Morey, M.A., Dr. Phil., is a learned and scholarly study of the twelfth century in England. This century has been increasingly studied in recent times, especially the years in which the struggle between Henry II. and Becket held the stage. Though much has been written about Becket, little or nothing has been written about his bishops, and yet many of them were able and outstanding men. The author of this volume seeks to do something to fill the gap. Choosing the Exeter bishop as his subject, he tells us what is known or can be reasonably conjectured about his life and career, and at the same time seizes the occasion to portray certain aspects of English Church life in the twelfth century, notably the working of the papal system of judges-delegate as seen in Bartholomew's administration of the canon law.

Dom Morey allows that the material available for the historian is insufficiently detailed to allow of any very intimate or convincing picture of Bartholomew's character and personality being drawn. But this much he thinks we may safely affirm: 'In elevation of character he was superior to the king; in restraint and diplomatic ability he seems to have excelled St. Thomas; and throughout he was the benefactor and personal friend of John of Salisbury. As regards both learning and religion he seems to have been all that an able bishop should be, and in this it is not claiming too much to assert that he was on the whole characteristic of the English episcopate of the time.'

One-third of the work is biographical, supplemented by an Appendix on the Early Archdeacons of Exeter and another on Charters and Other Documents. The rest of the work consists of an edition of Bartholomew's 'Penitential' with a suitable Introduction. The 'Penitential' is one of the three theological works attributed to the Exeter bishop and conforms to the general character of the penitential, which was essentially a catalogue of sins and their punishments, intended as a guide for confessors in the exercise of their function. The wide popularity of Bartholomew's 'Penitential' may be gathered from the fact that no fewer than eighteen copies have come to light. In view of the slightness of the variations in many of the manuscripts, Dom Morey did not think it necessary to collate the whole eighteen, and indeed has been content to print the text of a single manuscript, the Cotton MS. Vitellius A. XII., which is now in the British Museum Library.

DR. FOSDICK.

The S.C.M. Press has just published the first British edition of Dr. Fosdick's *Successful Christian Living* (6s. net). Some of the chapters have already appeared in 'The Christian World,' but much appears to be quite new. Dr. Fosdick has a place peculiarly his own, and it would be difficult to find any volume of sermons that one could give with more confidence to those who feel that much of the present-day preaching is alien to their own interests and thoughts. A large part of the volume deals with Social Reconstruction. Talking about the 'no-God exhibits' in Russia, Dr. Fosdick says: 'We have plenty of "no-God exhibits" here. If war and slums and lynching and penury in the midst of possible plenty are not "no-God exhibits," then there never has been one. We Christians have been tremendously concerned about theoretical denials of God in philosophy, but we never have been enough concerned about real denials of God in Society.' But Dr. Fosdick does not make the mistake of beginning with Social Reconstruction. The chapters on 'Six ways in which modern man can pray,' and 'Discovering what we can do with ourselves,' come before those on Social Reconstruction. And to those who say to him that they are interested not so much in what they can do with themselves as in what we ought to do with the world, he replies: 'I answer that I, too, am concerned about the world and that, if we follow far enough this trail we have started on, it will land us in the thick of the world. But, certainly, it is far easier to discuss the problems of the world in general than to face this interior challenge: The world being what it is, what can I get out of Me that is likely to do the world any good? That is not evading or forgetting the world's problem, but bringing it close to one's doorstep.'

HYMNS.

Two interesting books have been issued recently dealing with our English hymns. *Hymnody Past and Present*, by the Rev. C. S. Phillips, M.A., D.D. (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d. net), is an exhaustive treatise of three hundred octavo pages, treated with all the fullness of modern scholarship. The book is divided into three parts: Historical, Practical, and an Appendix giving a large number of technical notes and references. The historical development of Hymnology is treated with considerable detail, carrying the story from the Early Church through Eastern, Latin, and German Hymnody, and then a full account of English Hymnody with considerable stress upon the Methodist and Evangelical Movements. A critical chapter is devoted to new ideas in our present century. The second portion, devoted to the practical side of Hymnology, is very brief, with the result that the advice and information are not so practical as might be wished.

The second book, *The Highway of Praise*, by the Rev. J. R. Fleming, D.D. (Milford; 3s. 6d. net), is written on more popular lines in which the practical side is emphasized more fully. This is a very readable volume, giving interesting information about composers, together with some useful hints on organ music in Church worship. Some of the criticisms of the use of hymns at funerals and weddings are very trenchant, and useful suggestions are made. This is a book to be recommended to all who are working for the improvement of our Church music. It would make an excellent text-book for a course of addresses.

Messrs. Allen & Unwin have published a new edition of Mr. Bertrand Russell's *A Critical Exposition of the Philosophy of Leibniz* (12s. 6d. net). The author has contributed an interesting new Preface to this volume in which he makes changes in a few of his earlier statements. But generally his views on the philosophy of Leibniz have not changed since the book first appeared in 1900.

Until he published 'High Country,' the Reverend Alistair MacLean of Daviot was little known. But that volume made him many friends. And now in *Walk in the Light* (Allenson; 5s. net.) his readers will have their last volume from his pen. After Mr. MacLean died, his friend Mr. Donald MacGillivray went through all the literary work he had left and chose forty-eight short addresses. It is these that we now have, accompanied by a foreword by Dr. James Black, who says: 'It is finely characteristic of the interesting mind and personality of its author: for every address is beautifully conceived, suggestively illustrated, and artistically finished.' Those who do not know Mr. MacLean's sermons, but who have read 'Fearfulness' in 'The Christian Year' last month will want this volume.

Under the title, *The Distinctive Elements in Christianity* (T. & T. Clark; 2s. net), the Rev. Norman V. Hope, M.A., B.D., has translated the late Professor Karl Holl's essay, first published in 1925, *Urchristentum und Religionsgeschichte*. From the Foreword by Professor Hugh Watt one learns that this is the first of Holl's works to appear in an English translation. The four chapters of the volume deal succinctly, but clearly and authoritatively, with the subjects of (1) The Place of Christianity in the Oriental Religions, (2) Jesus' Conception of God, (3) Is Paul the Creator of Christian Syncretism? (4) The Paradox of Christianity.

In the first chapter, Reitzenstein's Persian redemption-mystery is critically handled, and the point enforced that the essence of Christianity does not so much lie in what it has in common with other religions as in what is peculiar to itself.

In the second chapter the peculiar and unique feature of Christianity is discovered in Jesus' reversal of the customary relationship between religion and morality (morality being here understood in a sense that includes obedience to ceremonial law). Whereas every other higher religion bases the personal relationship to God upon correct behaviour towards men, with Jesus God takes the initiative, with His forgiveness creating something quite new, out of which there at once arises a real and close fellowship with Him.

In the third chapter it is maintained that even if all that is said to-day be true regarding Hellenistic influence upon Paul, it was he none the less who kept Christianity from being submerged in Hellenism. The gospel is something different, he said, from all worldly wisdom.

The short final chapter invites us to recognize that in the history of the Christian Church progress and degeneration have taken place alongside of each other.

It was worth while to publish in English an essay of such grasp and comprehensiveness. It reads well in translation. We trust that a good reception of it in the English world will encourage the translator to give us more of Karl Holl.

A Priest for Ever (James Clarke; 6s. net) is a study of the Epistle to the Hebrews, comprising the Bruce Lectures delivered in Trinity College, Glasgow, in 1933, by the Rev. J. P. Alexander, Jedburgh. In a Foreword, Principal W. M. Macgregor commends the book as dealing with an epistle which should be more familiarly known, and as a patient and sincere effort to reveal its treasures.

After discussing the question of the writer and his friends, Mr. Alexander goes on to deal with the framework of ideas in which the portrait of Christ is presented—first, the writer's philosophy, 'The World to Come'; secondly, his fundamental conception of religion, 'Let us Draw Near.' After that he deals with the portrait itself—first, Jesus in His person, 'The Son of God'; secondly, Jesus in His work, 'Lord,' 'Over God's House,' 'A Priest for Ever.' The last two chapters have to do with the threatened apostasy in the community to which the epistle is addressed and with the writer's conception of faith.

Mr. Alexander has succeeded in covering most of the ground that an expositor may be expected to cover. He has made good use of recent English commentaries on the epistle. His own expositions are clear and pointed, and often lively, and show independence of judgment. He has obviously devoted much time and care to the preparation of this volume, and it deserves a good circulation.

Messrs. James Clarke & Co. have begun the publication of a new series of books, called 'The Challenge Series,' with three books, two of which are apparently new, the third being eleven years old. The new volumes are *The Church and the Churches*, by Professor Karl Barth (referred to elsewhere), and *The Essentials of Life and Thought*, by the Rev. G. Currie Martin, M.A., B.D., the Rev. T. Wigley, M.A., the Rev. Kenneth A. Saunders, M.A., B.Litt., and the Rev. T. Rhondda Williams, D.D. The older volume is *The Roots of Religion in the Human Soul*, by Professor John Baillie, D.Litt., D.D., S.T.D. This last is an admirable treatment of a fundamental theme, with a little of the gloss taken away by the fact that the writer has in his mind a situation that is already a little out of date. But the main contentions of the book are independent of date, and, in its cheap form the essay is sure to be popular and edifying. The least satisfactory of the three books is the second mentioned above. It might easily have come, in parts at least, from the Rationalist Press. The essay on Jesus is a negative affair that leaves nothing of the historic figure of Jesus to account in any way for the influence He has had on the world. The writer too readily accepts negative conclusions of those he relies on for his own views, and the Jesus that is left would not cause a ripple on the surface of life. The other essays are on the Bible, God, and Man. It is a surprising thing that Professor Barth's book and this very 'Modernist' one should appear in the same series. The price of the books is 1s. each.

The Chaplain to the University of Glasgow, the Rev. Archibald C. Craig, M.C., M.A., has published sixteen of his Sermons and Addresses. It is hardly necessary to say that the sermons are scholarly, and they have been written by one who is in close touch with young men and young women. In 'The Christian Year' this month we have quoted a part of one of the Addresses—'The Presence of the Absence of God,' and so readers will have the opportunity of seeing for themselves the quality of the work. The Sermons deal with three subjects—Repentance, Faith, and Duty. The publishers are Messrs. James Clarke & Co., and they are to be congratulated on the attractive and dignified volume which they have produced at the price of 3s. 6d. net. The title is *University Sermons*.

To the growing list of up-to-date Jewish works on the Old Testament we have now to add an American commentary on Deuteronomy by a member of the staff of Dropsie College—*The Holy Scriptures with Commentary: Deuteronomy*, by Professor Joseph Reider, Ph.D. (Jewish Publication Society of America; $2.50). It seems that a series of commentaries was planned some thirty years ago, but the only volume which appeared was one on Micah by Professor Margolis. Allowing for the fact that it is addressed to a Jewish audience, Dr. Reider's work will strongly remind the reader of Wheeler Robinson's commentary in 'The Century Bible.' It is true that it does not give the same impression of insight into the psychology and theology of its subject, but it has, on the other hand, useful notes on the Hebrew text, abundant citation of Rabbinic writings, and copious references to authorities like Robertson Smith, while a good deal of space is occupied with arguments directed against the Graf-Wellhausen school of criticism. It is interesting to note how often both commentators select the same phrases, and how often their remarks seem to coincide in substance, though not in language. As far as exposition is concerned, then, Dr. Reider has little to add to our understanding of Deuteronomy itself, but his work will be found useful, not only by Jews, but also by Christians who wish to gain some insight into the traditional Jewish methods of exegesis.

At St. Ninian's, Lassodie, Fife, Scotland, a National Experimental and Conference Centre has been started, and a subsidiary enterprise is the publication of books by the Lassodie Press Ltd. A number of cheap, popular editions have now been issued at the uniform price of 2s. 6d. This affords a really good opportunity of getting some useful books at very reasonable rates. There is, for example, *The Sunday School in the Modern World*, edited by the Rev. D. P. Thomson, M.A., in collaboration with the Rev. Carey Bonner and Dr. James Kelly. This volume was originally published in 1924 by Messrs. James Clarke at 6s., and we had pleasure then in drawing attention to the wideness of the ground covered and the authoritativeness of the chapters written by Mr. W. Melville Harris, Mr. Carey Bonner, Principal A. E. Garvie, Principal W. M. Clow, Dr. Thisleton Mark, Principal Sydney Cave, etc.

The other volumes in this popular edition are *The Scottish Pulpit*, twenty-one sermons by some of Scotland's foremost preachers; *The Church in Changing Scotland*, by the Rev. Arthur H. Dunnett, B.D., who is Joint Secretary of the Church of Scotland Home Board, and Chairman of the Scottish Churches Film Guild; and *The Romance of Blantyre*, an account by the Rev. Alexander Hetherwick, C.B.E., D.D., of how Livingstone's dream came true.

A reprint of *Winning the Children for Christ*, which was published by the National Sunday School Union in 1924, has also been issued by the Lassodie Press at the amazingly small price of 2s. There are a dozen contributors, most of them well-known names, like Professor J. G. Mackenzie, Thistleton Mark, Albert Belden, D. P. Thomson, and W. D. Miller. The object of the book was to present to teachers and others interested in the young the newer approach to children on behalf of Christ and the Church. It aims at relating the fruits of scientific research on the one hand and practical experience on the other to the religious development of the child and the problem of child conversion. There is a good deal of science in these essays and a lot of common sense. And it may be hoped that in this new issue their helpfulness will be largely extended.

Any one interested in the work being done by the Experimental Centre at St. Ninian's—the holding of Retreats and Conferences; an Information Bureau, Colportage and bookstall—may obtain particulars from the Warden, St. Ninian's, Lassodie, Fife.

The 'Journal' of George Fox is well known, but his 'Pastoral Epistles' are very little known. 'A Collection of Many Select and Christian Epistles, Letters, and Testimonies. Written on sundry Occasions by that Ancient, Eminent, Faithful Friend and Minister of Jesus Christ, George Fox,' was published in 1698 but has only been reprinted once since that date—in 1831. In England in 1925 an anthology appeared prepared by Samuel Tuke, of York. This fell into the hands of Mrs. John Holdsworth (L. V. Hodgkin), and from it she conceived the idea of making an anthology herself, and it has now been published by Messrs. Macmillan with the title, *A Day-Book of Counsel and Comfort from the Epistles of George Fox* (7s. 6d. net). This is a fine addition to one's devotional library.

His Part and Ours, by the Rev. J. Sidlow Baxter (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 3s. 6d. net), is described in the sub-title as 'devotional expositions gathering round the Scripture usage of the possessive pronoun "my".' These expositions are in two sections, the first dealing with 'His Part' under such titles as My Grace, My Presence, My Peace, etc.; the second dealing with 'Our Part' under such titles as My Redeemer, My Helper, My Beloved. The writer is a popular preacher and expositor, and his method of handling Scripture is reminiscent of Dr. Campbell Morgan. He adheres closely to the text, and delights in comparing Scripture with Scripture. At times he brings out curious interpretations. He is not critical but homiletical; he does not argue, he rhapsodizes. His expositions are warmly evangelical and provide rich feeding, perhaps too rich for some palates. On p. 42 he repeats the traditional story of the hymn 'Lead Kindly Light' having been composed in the near prospect of the author's death in 1847, whereas in point of fact it was composed nearly thirty years before.

The National Adult School Union have published an excellent scheme of study with the title *Achievement and Challenge*, being the Adult School Lesson Handbook for 1938. There are studies by W. H. Leighton, George Peverett, and James L. Baker on 'Achievement: What Next?', on 'Modern Times and Modern Men' by T. Herdman, on 'The Great Society' by Gregory Chase, on 'The Teaching of Jesus' by A. Frank Ward, on 'God's Way with Man' by Anna L. Littleboy. The price of the Handbook is in limp covers 1s. 6d. and cloth boards 2s. 6d. net.

With the beginning of a new year we have to draw attention to the excellent helps printed for Sunday-school teachers by the National Sunday School Union. There are first of all the graded courses, comprising *The Beginners' Concise Guide* (2s. 6d.), *The Primary Concise Guide* (3s. 6d.), *The Junior Concise Guide* (3s. 6d.), *The Intermediate Concise Guide* (3s. 6d.), and *The Morning Concise Guide* (2s. 6d.). They have also published most suggestive *Notes on the Scripture Lessons* (3s. 6d.). The Concise Guides are edited by Mr. Ernest H. Hayes, and the Notes by Mr. J. Eaton Feasey.

The Religion of the Incarnation, by the Rev. Ernest H. Rudkin, M.A., B.D. (Skeffington; 6s. net), deals with 'some selected subjects concerning Christian doctrine and personal belief inspired by the Archbishop's Recall to Religion.' There are twenty-one addresses in all, and they fall into three main divisions—The Godward Side, The Manward Side, and The Church. Besides these addresses there are an equal number of 'addenda,' each of which contains a brief and suggestive treatment of some topic relevant to the main theme. The expositions are simple and instructional, full of excellent preaching matter, and giving evidence of wide reading and a gift for apt illustration. The book should prove eminently helpful to teachers and evangelists who seek to present the Christian message in an orderly and convincing way.

Messrs. Arthur H. Stockwell Ltd. have published a volume of essays at 3s. 6d. by Mrs. Sophia H. E. Langmaid—*A Selection of Essays*. Mrs. Langmaid is a busy wife and mother, and it is only by the strictest economy of her time that she has been able to write these short essays. They are full of sound sense, and deal with such subjects as 'The Church and the Child,' 'How to Keep Young,' 'Modern Unrest—Its Cause and Effect,' 'Is Perfection Possible?' 'That Sunday Dinner—What It Means,' 'What Are We to Believe?'

We have already drawn attention to a series of valuable small books published by the S.C.M. Press —'Life in Other Lands.' Miss Hebe Spaull has now added *Czechoslovakia* (1s. 6d. net). Miss

Spaull has the gift of writing interestingly for boys and girls, and to-day, when it is more important than ever that the history, customs, and difficulties of other lands should be known, a series such as this is to be most warmly commended.

The latest volumes in the 'Religion and Life Books' (S.C.M.; 1s. net each) are *The Making and Meaning of the Bible*, by Mr. George Barclay, M.A., and *St. Mark's Life of Jesus*, by Professor Theodore H. Robinson, D.D.

Fellowship in Worship.

By Professor Harold Roberts, Ph.D., Wesley College, Headingley, Leeds.

The idea of fellowship is peculiarly congenial to the modern mind. No programme, whether it be religious, social, or political, is likely to make a wide appeal to-day unless it takes account of the passion for fellowship that dominates contemporary life and thought. The generous reception accorded in some quarters to the totalitarian philosophy and to the various group-movements that have arisen within the Church in recent years is due in part to the fact that, in this regard, they have discerned the signs of the times. When, however, a certain idea becomes popular, it is soon overlaid with accretions which effectively obscure its meaning. This fate has befallen the idea of fellowship with the result that spurious forms of the real thing are distressingly common. An attempt will be made in this article to examine the significance of fellowship and to show that the way to its realization lies in worship which is the characteristic activity of the Christian Church.

I

What is the meaning of fellowship? First, let it be said that fellowship is found rather than made, and it is found or given as the result of a free response to a common purpose. In a sense it may be described as the by-product of this response. Hence, every attempt to engineer fellowship by exhorting people to come together is bound to fail. Indeed, while the bringing of people together may be a condition of fellowship, nothing more than a vague fraternization is achieved unless those who are gathered are united by a common purpose. In the second place, the quality and permanence of fellowship are determined by the character of the purpose which gives it birth. People may be drawn together by a common interest of which fellowship is not an integral part. Fellowship thus becomes a means to an end and is not regarded as having value for its own sake. It is possible for people who do not love one another overmuch to co-operate for the abolition of certain evils which endanger their personal or communal happiness. In such cases fellowship is but an expedient that is employed because no other method is available, and as soon as the end which it serves is attained, it is usually dissolved. Or, again, a nation may be galvanized into unity by fear of a common foe. When the occasion which aroused antagonism passes, the unity of the nation is often broken although the hatred and suspicion which have been allowed free play live on. It is clear, then, that the common purpose of which we are in quest must be universal in its appeal and provide a permanent basis for a fellowship from which every shred of hostility has been removed. Thirdly, fellowship cannot exist in a vacuum. We tend to speak of it as though it were something intangible—an atmosphere or a pleasant aroma. It is of the nature of fellowship to seek concrete expression in personal relationships. Fourthly, the law of fellowship is sacrifice. The reason why social life so rarely issues in fellowship is to be traced to the common belief that a recognition of the rights of others is the most effective method of securing our own interests. The prevailing spirit is self-centredness even if it sometimes clothes itself in altruistic form. It is only when men are content to abandon claims and counter-claims and take up their cross in devotion to a cause that is free from every selfish taint that fellowship is established on a sure foundation.

II

The Church according to the New Testament is a fellowship, and ideally it bears the marks to which we have referred in the previous section. It is described as sharing in the fellowship of the Holy Spirit—a phrase which characterizes the origin and quality of its life. The fellowship which the Church enjoys is the gift of the Spirit which is bestowed in response to the love of God revealed in Jesus Christ. We do not read that the earliest Christians organized themselves into a society in order that they might propagate more effectively the principles of a departed Leader. On the contrary, they found themselves in fellowship with one another through sharing in the new experience which had come to them by the life, death, and resurrection of their Lord. What are known as the marks of the Church—one, holy, catholic, apostolic—set forth plainly enough the character of its life as a supernatural fellowship. Its unity is to be traced not to any external pressure in the shape of a powerful organization but to the relationship of its members to Christ; they have fellowship with one another because they are 'in Christ.' The Church is described as holy since the spirit of Christ is reflected in its thought, worship, and practice. It is catholic—the experience of God which the Church enjoys is open to all—and apostolic—it is sent forth by God charged with the good news of His purpose for the world. The metaphors employed in the New Testament are equally emphatic in their delineation of the Church as a fellowship which has its source in the life of God Himself. It is the Body of Christ, the household of God, the holy temple—the dwelling-place of God's Spirit. There were many religious societies or clubs in the Empire in the time of our Lord but the Church was not one of them. It is the creation of God, and its nature can only be understood in the light of its divine origin.

There are four further observations to be made about the nature of the Church. First, its fellowship embraces heaven and earth. It is extremely doubtful whether the doctrine of the Communion of Saints interpreted as meaning unbroken intercourse between the living and the dead is taught in the New Testament. On the other hand, it is a fair inference from what the New Testament teaches about the nature of the Church. The members of the Church are made one by reason of their faith in Christ who overcame death, and the gates of Hades cannot prevail against those who share in the power of His resurrection. To be 'in Christ' is, indeed, here and now to be in heaven. 'God, being rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us . . . quickened us together with Christ . . . and raised us up with him, and made us to sit with him in the heavenly places, in Christ Jesus' (Eph 2[4-6]). Death cannot sever the communion of believers since the living and the departed are united by faith in the living Christ. Secondly, the fellowship of the Church is all-pervasive. Its members share not only in spiritual riches but in material goods (cf. Ro 15[26-7]). What is sometimes described as the early Christian experiment in Communism should not be brushed aside as a historical oddity; it was a serious attempt to deal faithfully with the implications of the 'partnership of the Spirit' (C. H. Dodd). The breaking down of barriers based upon economic status, sex, race is another instance of the outworking of this partnership. In the letter to the Ephesians (chs. 4–6), St. Paul gives an outline of the communal life of those who are 'in Christ.' Since there is one body and one Spirit, 'let him that stole steal no more, let no corrupt speech proceed out of your mouth . . . let all bitterness and wrath and anger . . . be put away . . . walk in love. . . .' The relations between husband and wife, parents and children, masters and servants, are to be governed not by considerations of expediency but by the consciousness of membership in one body. Thirdly, those who have been called into the fellowship of the Church share the redemptive sufferings of Christ. There is nothing in the Gospels or the Epistles to encourage the view that the sufferings of Jesus were other than unique, but 'the fellowship of His sufferings' to which St. Paul refers in a characteristic passage does imply that the members of the body of Christ participate actively in the work of redemptive love. 'The cup that I drink ye shall drink' (Mk 10[39]). This promise was fulfilled in the life of the Christian fellowship. Fourthly, the corporate experience of the Church was expressed in specific acts of worship, prayer, and the observance of the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Prayer and Sacrament sum up the characteristic activity of the Christian community, which is worship.

III

The significance of Christian worship can only be understood in the light of the nature of the Church. As we have seen, the Church shares in the fellowship of the Holy Spirit, and it came into being through the response of men to the love of God mediated through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. In that response, the heart of Christian worship is displayed. It may be readily admitted that the spirit of worship is manifested wherever men submit to the call of conscience or follow the vision of beauty or dedicate their minds to the disinterested pursuit of truth. Indeed, these interests must not be disparaged in the attempt to establish the uniqueness of Christian worship. They are inspired by the true light that lighteth every man, and instead of minimizing their significance when they are dissociated from the Christian revelation, the theologian should be concerned to interpret them in the light of that revelation, in which alone they find their fulfilment. On the other hand, the distinctive element of Christian worship is the response of the soul to the call of God in Jesus Christ. It is that act of dedication which enables the Christian to honour the claims of God over the whole area of human life. Where the primacy of the Christian revelation of God is ignored, worship tends to become pantheistic, and thoroughgoing pantheism is but another name for secularism. To say that God is everywhere is only another way of saying that He is nowhere. Hence, we need to beware of underestimating the importance of those acts of worship which enable us to concentrate our attention upon the Vision of God in Christ and to enjoy personal communion with Him. The adoration of God at regular times and seasons is only regarded as superfluous by those upon whom the wonder of Divine Grace has not dawned. Further, if worship means union with God in His redemptive activity in the world we need to wait upon Him in prayer to learn His will and to gain deliverance from the bondage of self-concern which constantly mars our service to God and our fellow-men. The Church has stressed the central significance of special acts of worship not because it is indifferent to other activities but partly in order that life in every part may reflect the glory of God.

Both the ‘ direct ’ and ‘ indirect ’ forms of worship to which we have referred presuppose corporateness. While there are some people who are prepared to recognize that the social tasks of the Church—the abolition of war or poverty—require corporate action they still cling to individualistic notions of private prayer and common worship. It seems necessary, therefore, to relate the theology of the Church as outlined in the previous section to particular acts of worship. Each man, it is true, must make his own response to the love of God, but by the very act of making it he ends his isolation. He takes his place in the household of God. He shares in the life of fellowship. ‘ If any man is in Christ he is a new creature ’ : his thoughts, words, and works bear the imprint of the family to which he belongs. In every act of worship the Christian is a corporate worshipper. He communes with God not as an isolated individual, even though he may be physically isolated, but as a member of the Body of Christ. While in private devotion his personal needs and responsibilities will loom larger than they do in public worship, he is not thereby separated from the Christian community, since even in the most intimate moments of a secluded devotion his relationship to God is still a family relationship. A Christian cannot pray other than as a child of God, and God only becomes accessible to us as Father in so far as we recognize the fact that we are not so many different units bearing no relation to one another but fellow-members of His household. ‘ We know,’ writes Khomiakoff (quoted by Riley, *Birkbeck and the Russian Church*), ‘ that when any one of us falls, he falls alone, but no one is saved alone. He who is saved is saved in the Church, as a member of her and in unity with all her other members. If any believes, he is in the communion of faith : if he loves, he is in the communion of love : if he prays, he is in the communion of prayer.’

When we turn to ordered worship we find that, although it has many varieties, the elements of which each is composed bring out the corporate character of worship. In the simplest as well as in the most elaborate forms, place is given to confession, praise, aspiration, intercession, and dedication. If we examine these constituent parts, we shall find that they presuppose the idea of fellowship. We confess our sins, and what is sin but a violation of the spirit of fellowship. All sin is sin against God ; but we cannot sin against God without sinning against His family which embraces all mankind. And the forgiveness that is offered to us if we repent means a deliverance from self-centredness into the fellowship of God and His children. When we make our offering of praise, we recall ‘ the blessings of this life,’ many of which come to us through the sacrament of human hands. Chiefly, we give thanks ‘ for the redemption of the world through our Lord Jesus Christ,’ ‘ the means of grace,’ which belong to the Church as a whole, and ‘ for the hope of glory ’—the consummation of the eternal purpose of God for mankind. Each brings his own sacrifice of praise, but it is offered in union with the sacrifices of the redeemed in heaven and on earth. Our prayers of aspiration again are directed to a more perfect fulfilment of our function as members of the Body of Christ, while our intercession is of nothing worth unless it is the expression of fellowship. Finally, common worship should issue in an act of dedication, and the end to which we consecrate our lives is a community which freely and gladly accepts the rule of God the Father. Nowhere is the corporate character of worship more plainly revealed than in the Sacrament of Holy Communion. We come to receive Christ Himself into our hearts. He is present in every Eucharist and not even our sin can drive Him away. The Real Presence is not at the mercy of man's changing moods or ideals or theories. That Presence is symbolized by bread and wine which become the instruments by which the sacrificial life of Christ is conveyed to us. When we take and eat and feed on Him, we become incorporated in His redeeming purpose and share in the life that was obedient unto death. God gives us Himself in Christ and His nature is Love. Where love is, there fellowship abounds. Hence we meet at a common table and the differences which bring discord and disunity into human life are gathered up in this service into a richer harmony. Here death itself does not divide, for the congregation embraces angels and archangels and all the company of heaven. And when we separate, we resume our daily tasks not as so many isolated individuals but as fellow-members of the Body of Christ who have received heavenly food for the journey that ends in the City of God.

While it is true that every recognized type of public worship seeks to express the idea of corporateness, it cannot be denied that there are some forms in which the idea is only realized by the average worshipper with difficulty. 'In the early Church,' says Father Hebert (*Liturgy and Society*, 75), 'the deliberate effort was made to divide up the functions of worship among as many people as possible. The Bishop was when possible the celebrant, and was surrounded by his priests who (at least at Rome) con-celebrated with him; the deacons headed by the archdeacon, and the subdeacons had their share in the reading of the lessons and the ceremonial of the altar: chanters and choir, acolytes and doorkeepers all had their place; the people, too, had their share in the action, in the offering of the gift and the kiss of peace and the communion.' Here we have an ideal which we need to recover in the ordering of public worship. The ritual of Low Mass, for example, in which the congregation takes no part but is united to the action of the priest by intention, as well as the average Free Church service at which the congregation 'assists' only by the singing of hymns, can hardly be regarded as an adequate representation of the corporate character of Christian worship. It may be admitted that in Low Mass the corporate principle is not ignored since those present who apprehend its meaning are able to link their private prayers with the ritual action of the priest and thus share in the worship of the whole Church. And, again, in Free Church services, the congregation may be and often is conscious of itself as a fellowship; through the prayers and the sermons its members are inspired to offer their worship to God as one Body. Nevertheless it is easy in either type of service to fall a prey to individualistic devotion and to find oneself 'solus cum solo' which is not the pattern of Christian worship. (For fuller treatment of these points, cf. Fr. Hebert's book already quoted and Miss Underhill's recent volume on *Worship*.) The question of the reform of public worship does not enter into the scope of this article, but it is certainly important that any changes in the forms of worship should express its corporate character. A worship that is truly corporate sets forth as nothing else can the nature of God's purpose for mankind. Here barriers of class, race, and culture are broken down, ancient feuds are ended, and men are united to one another not by any act of their own but by a common response to the Incarnate Love of God in Jesus Christ. This fellowship is governed by love, and the discipline which love entails is willingly accepted, for it is creative of a life that is 'disinfected of egotism,' balanced and enriched by the unlimited resources of the Communion of Saints, and dedicated to the establishment of God's rule over every human concern.

The worship of the Church, alas, falls short of this ideal, partly because all men have not yet responded to the Love of God. We shall not fully know the wonder and majesty of Christian worship until the children of God in every nation bring their gifts to the altar and take their place in His family. The missionary work of the Church is, however, hampered by the disunity of Christendom. There is so little fellowship in worship between members of different Christian communions and so imperfect an understanding of those forms of devotion adopted in Churches other than our own. Christian re-union means fellowship in worship, and we can hasten its coming by a reverent attempt to appreciate the devotional life of our fellow-Christians in other Churches. But there is yet another stumbling-block. We all have to confess our frequent failure to realize fellowship with the members of the Church to which we belong. Our worship is often public without being corporate. It is plainly futile to talk of communion with the saints in heaven when we are barely conscious of a link with the saints on earth who worship with us. The solution is to be found not by making a deliberate effort to check our individualism but by such a rediscovery of the nature of our faith as will enable us to perceive that an approach to God that denies or is indifferent to fellowship is sheer idolatry. And let it not be forgotten that fellowship in worship means sharing in the material things of life. The degree of reality that obtains in special acts of prayer and praise and in the observance of the Sacraments may be tested by our willingness to baptize all our personal relationships, social and economic, into the service of God. Then and then alone will the worship of the Church become the expression of the eternal purpose of God and the instrument of its fulfilment.

The Return of Theology to the Church.

By the Reverend James D. Smart, M.A., Ph.D., Galt, Ontario, Canada.

The unfortunate fate of Karl Barth in the English-speaking world is that he has come to be regarded as the founder of the latest religious movement. Barthianism, in the minds of many, is classified alongside Buchmanism. Each has a special set of terms of which one grows frightfully weary when trying to carry on a conversation with devotees. Buchmanites talk of 'guidance,' 'quiet hours,' and 'life-changing,' where the Barthian talks more loftily of 'the otherness of God,' 'the nothingness of man,' 'death,' and 'resurrection.' There is also the fact that so many who have 'taken up' with Barthianism have done so avowedly because of what they call the religious vitality of it; it gives them an assurance and earnestness which have a good effect upon their preaching; it makes them feel more reality in their faith. But it is for reasons very similar to those that other men have turned to Buchmanism. It is little wonder that the impression has gone abroad that Barthianism is just another religious movement which will have its day, will make a contribution to the Church's life as such movements do, and then will pass into the limbo where all such peculiar religious ideologies go.

To others, more thoughtful, Barthianism represents a set of theological ideas, well worthy of our consideration, and which we may adopt either in part or as a whole. The favourite attitude is to recognize with gratitude several much needed emphases in Barth's theology, and then to wave aside the remainder as hardly worth our attention or incredible to a really enlightened modern theologian. Again and again we hear of Barth's great contribution to the Church in redirecting men's minds to the transcendence of God, but such statements are usually followed by conditioning sentences which make of transcendence a conception far removed from anything which Barth teaches. It would be far better if such men would refrain from trying to steal Barth's so-called 'values' for themselves, and, recognizing simply that he thinks differently than they do, would let him speak his own mind fully and truthfully as a mind distinct from theirs.

Then there are men who seek and find in Barth a satisfying theology. He brings their minds to rest, quiets all their doubts and uncertainties, resolves their religious problems and perplexities. They accept as a whole and with enthusiasm the set of ideas which he presents. One writer describes the achievement of Barth as the erection of a great massive structure of Reformed theology. The word 'structure' suggests a building erected by one set of men that others may dwell in it in comfort. Many have already moved into the Barthian structure because they find it more comfortable and suited to their minds than any of the other theological structures.

All these points of view manifest an ignorance of the central intention of Barth's work in theology. He has no interest in a Barthianism by which men seek to lend a new vitality to their Christianity. Nor is he concerned that men should 'accept' his theological ideas, either as a whole or in part. His concern is to re-establish theology in the Church as a primary function of the Christian ministry. He seeks to bring the Church back to theology and theology back to the Church. To those who come to him seeking a satisfying theology, he offers instead an invitation to work with him in the labours of the Church's theology. They seek a pleasant tree under which to rest, but he gives them a spade and shows them a plot in the garden in which to dig. He thrusts upon us the recognition that there is no theology which we can adopt, no theological position in which we can rest, but only a theological task at which we must work incessantly as the inescapable responsibility of our ministry.

It will be admitted without argument that this strikes the ministry of the Church to-day at its most vulnerable point. There are few who recognize serious work at theology as an integral part of their duty to the Church. One tries to keep in touch with what men are thinking, but in the busy life of a minister of our day, intensive theological studies find little place. To suggest that they are at least equal in importance with pastoral visitation and organization work, and thus should have a place made for them, would elicit only a smile. The general conviction is that theology, though important, may safely be left as the peculiar function of students and professors.

Theology, as Karl Barth describes it and practices it, belongs not in the College but in the Church. It is a function of the Church or it is nothing. In the opening pages of his 1932 Dogmatic, which with reason he calls *Church Dogmatic*, Barth lays plainly before us the nature of theology as it originates in the life-situation of the Church. The Church through its ministers is constantly proclaiming a message which it claims to be the Christian message. In all its life and activities it is acting upon definite principles which it holds to be Christian. But at the same time, unless we are entirely blind to realities, we know that the Church's message is in many respects untrue, and that there is always an element of falsity in the principles actuating its life. There may be some Christians who would not make this admission; they assume the perfection of their Church and the complete adequacy of their own message. But the true Church is humbler. It is ever acutely conscious of the imperfection of all that it does, and of its message being at best a poor stammering makeshift for the truth which it professes to represent. It knows that untruth in its message and falsity in its principles are the chief agencies in bringing it down to ruin and in frustrating the purposes for which it exists. In this situation, what shall we do? What escape is there from this dilemma? Theology is the one means whereby a way out can open before us. With full earnestness we must undertake the critical examination of every aspect of the Church's life and message that we may escape from untruth into truth. We must take up the position of watchman over the Church, that we may guard her from error both from within and from without. Our minds are constantly exposed to the varied intellectual and religious currents of our time; our thoughts are shaped imperceptibly by the influences we meet. But in theology we mount guard over our own thoughts and bring them under the judgment of the truth which is God's truth. Theology is thus the Church's one safeguard against error. Neglect of it leaves the door open for ideas and beliefs, which are Christian only in their appearance, to come slipping in and establish themselves in respectability within the Church. Neglect of it means that we have become careless about the question of truth.[1] If this, then, is the function of theology, it is difficult to see how any minister can evade the responsibility of theological work without being definitely unfaithful to the Church. This part of his duty must stand as a primary obligation of his office demanding a generous portion of his time.

The same thought may be put in a more direct and personal way. I stand in my pulpit and declare to my people what I believe to be the Christian message. In another Church, another man from his pulpit declares to his people a very different message which he believes to be the Christian message. Are we not to be concerned which is the truth? Are we to take the usual easy tolerant attitude, that every man has a right to his own point of view and that the Church is broad enough for all our messages? Or might not we too, as fellow-Christians, undertake a discussion together which would be not an attempt on the part of each to convert the other, but an attempt together to search out the truth of the matter? That would be theology. Tolerance is the order of the day, an easy tolerance, and if tolerance means that we always remember, even at the height of our conviction, that the other fellow may have some truth on his side, then who can be against it? But tolerance in the Church to-day has come to be nothing more or less than *an evasion of the question of truth*. It must land us eventually where some have already landed, in saying that truth is not the main element in the minister's message but personality, character, and sincerity. To be intolerant of untruth does not mean that we adopt the Pharisaical attitude of being critical of other men and satisfied with ourselves. It means before all else that we become *intolerant of the untruth in our message and principles.* We become intolerant of untruth because our loyalty to truth demands it of us and because we are convinced that it is truth and truth alone which can make men free. In this concern about the Church's untruth and our own untruth, theology is born. When the acute distress and agony of this situation breaks in upon us personally, we are driven to theology. Some seek quick temporary solutions in various religious movements and projects. But the need which must be met is a permanent need, and the one permanent solution is that there should be in the Church a theology which would *constantly* be subjecting to critical scrutiny the whole of the Church's message and the principles which are motivating its life.

---

[1] Some may object that I omit what is most important when I say so little of the standard by which theology judges the Church's life and message. The standard is the Church's nature, Jesus Christ, the word of God as revealed in the Scriptures. Theology seeks to keep the Church true to its nature in all things. To discuss this in the present article would carry us too far afield.

Denunciations of ministers for their lack of interest in theology are common enough. But much is to be said in their defence on this point. The blame is not entirely theirs. Their lack of interest is due to a large extent to the nature of theology in its modern developments. It has become of such a nature that it lacks vital interest for the man in the pulpit. It has come to be something in which a man may take an interest *alongside* his work as minister, just as he may maintain an interest in art or mathematics, but he is conscious, sometimes acutely conscious, that he is riding two horses. Why is it that theology has come to be regarded as an occupation for students and professors but not for active ministers? Is it not because theology has more and more centred itself in the life-situation of the man of culture and the university rather than in the life-situation of the Church? It has become divorced from the Church by its interests and questions ceasing to be those with which the Church is concerned in its life day by day.

The change in the orientation of theology began with Schleiermacher over one hundred years ago. We might say of him that he moved theology out of the Church into the school. He set theology to a new task, the defence of religion against the intellectual currents of his time which challenged its validity. But that involved him in another task. In order to defend religion, he had first to define in comprehensible terms the nature of religion. One has only to examine recent books, such as Oman's *The Natural and the Supernatural* and Baillie's *Interpretation of Religion*, to see that the orientation of theology in its main stream has remained essentially the same down to the present day; it has before it the same two objectives—to define the nature of religion and to defend it against the intellectual points of view which the student meets in the realm of learning. It is predominantly academic, and it is because its interests are centred in the academic life and not in the more commonplace and timeless life of man which the Church has to face day by day that ministers have ceased to feel that theology is a primary concern of their work.

We may illustrate this from two departments of theology—Old Testament and Philosophy of Religion.

The development of Old Testament science has been one of the epoch-making achievements of the last hundred years. The Church owes a lasting debt of gratitude to the men who have devoted their lives to establishing the frank and intelligent investigation of the Old Testament. But this department of theology has tended to renounce all theological interest and to become a purely scientific examination of the literature, the history, and the religion of the Hebrew people. The idea seems to be widely held that to be scientific it must be untheological. Attention is concentrated upon technical questions of the literature and history almost to the exclusion of all else.[1] But the minister finds that technical questions and critical theories and reconstructions are dry food for a man who has to speak a living message to his people. He can see a definite preparatory value in these things, but it is a source of constant amazement to him that this Old Testament science fails him so often when he seeks help in interpreting the *message* of the Old Testament. How often does it happen that he turns away from the critical commentaries in disappointment and drops down to the level of the uncritical 'devotional' commentaries!

As a second illustration, consider the history and philosophy of religion which has been displacing the study of Christian dogma. The development may be traced briefly. Schleiermacher, having set theology to the task of defending religion against its cultured despisers, had first of all to define what religion is. He took experience, his own experience and that of Christians within his sphere of observation, as the most defendable source of knowledge. He tried to define the nature of religion as an existing phenomena in himself and in those about him. Ritschl sought an improvement in the results by broadening the sphere of observation to take in the religious experience of the whole of Christian society from the beginning. He held to the original principle that by examining religious experience one should be able to arrive at a true definition of the nature of religion. A further widening of the sphere of investigation was inevitable when the similarity of much of Christian experience to non-Christian religious experience was recognized; the data had then to be drawn from the whole religious experience of man. Thus the present-day science of religion is the natural culmination of Schleiermacher's theology. It takes as its aim, as Baillie says in *The Interpretation of Religion*, 'to be able to announce to the world both what religion is at all times and what it is in its highest form.' Theology by an all-comprehensive study of religious phenomena is to give us a final answer to the question 'What is religion?' Flesh and blood, man by his research, shall reveal it, and no longer shall we as individuals be like Peter needing our Father in Heaven to reveal it to us in our hearts and lives. Intellectual comprehension will have made revelation a superfluity. Surely Barth had reason to call this 'modern theology's attempt to build a tower of Babel up to God.' But there remains a consciousness in the Church, however confused, that the philosophy of religion can never tell us the essential things we need to hear about God and life. The same consciousness remains often in the philosophers of religion as a discordant element in their thought. There is reason for the feeling of the average minister that this wide research into religious phenomena, however interesting it may be, has really no *essential* place in the life of the Church.

---

[1] One has only to examine any issue of the *Journal of Biblical Literature* or any other 'Biblical' journal to see that this is true.

Some words of Dr. J. H. Jowett in an address to the English Congregational Union in 1906 are of interest in this connexion. After speaking of the help derived by him from the various theological disciplines, he went on to say—'But I would have the entire discipline taken a step further, and I would be taught its direct bearing upon actual sin and sorrow, upon moral health and moral degeneracy, upon spiritual atrophy and spiritual endeavour, upon the fears and pessimisms of the aged, and the opening wonder and curiosity of the child.' He felt the need for a theology centred not so much in the special intellectual problems of a cultured class but rather in these deeper problems, these problems which are the same in every age, these eternal questionings in the hearts of the people before us on Sunday which have brought them there into the Church in the hope that they may find an answer. Edward Thurneysen puts it very forcefully in the closing words of his book, *The Word of God and the Church*—'Life rises up before us and makes its claim. What does this theology mean for life? Does it mean anything? We know what life is—folly, error, sin, injustice, passion, drunkenness, mammon, war. That is life, but still more, it is death. It means men who are out of work, women who are being exploited, children who are growing up without the sunlight, rich who are prisoners of their money, poor who have sunk down into bitterness. What does it mean that, in the midst of this life, you as a theologian found a theology, work at exegesis and dogmatics, and preach sermons? Is it not clear that if the one does not come within sight of the other, if our theology and this life have nothing to do with each other, if when you are sitting by your study-lamp with your problems you do not keep in mind the brother who lives there outside in the labourers' district in the distress of his poverty, or in the fashionable quarter in the distress of his wealth, indeed, if it is not definitely for the sake of this man and because you have him in mind that you work at your theology—then what use is all your theology?'

It was life rising up like that before them in all the naked reality of its need which made Barth and Thurneysen strike out in a new direction in theology. In a rare personal reference in his first book of addresses, Barth tells us how he went to his first congregation, well armed with a system of theology which was a combination of the teaching of Wm. Herrmann and the traditional doctrines of his Reformed Church. Then, as he realized the nature of the work he was attempting to do, as he saw that he must have a word which would be a living Word of God to speak into the actual situations of life, that the word he spoke must actually be food for men's souls, he found that his theological training had left him completely unprepared. It had not even suggested to him the nature of this task with which he was now confronted. That was the puzzling thing to him. Theology had been concerned with other and less vital matters. Therefore he set out not to found a new theology but to draw the attention of theologians to the fact that they were neglecting these matters which are most vital of all. He wrote his commentary on Romans to show that exegesis of the Scriptures must go beyond critical analysis and the understanding of a passage in the light of the times. His contention was that as exegesis the modern commentary leaves the main task untouched. Its chief and final task is the theological task—so to interpret the words of Scripture that the walls of the centuries which divide us, for instance, from Paul, become thin, and we hear him asking our questions and receiving answers, divine answers for himself and for us. The final task of Biblical science is that the living Word which sounded in the ears of the men of the Bible may sound forth into the ears of men to-day.

And in theology in general, Barth's function, as we have already seen, has been to bring theology back from the school to the Church. He asks the question—Is it not because theology has taken this other task and has left the Church's real theological task untouched that Protestantism finds itself in an evident process of disintegration to-day? Protestantism is divided not just into two or three camps but into hopeless individualism. If you ask—What does a Protestant believe? or, What is a Protestant's religion? you will get answers which range all the way from pantheism to rationalistic orthodoxy. We can understand what is meant when a prominent convert to Roman Catholicism says—'Whoever has become weary with the confusion and inconsistencies of a Protestantism which embraces every shade of world-view, finds such rest in the uniformity of the Catholic Church and in its great fellowship of faith and worship and prayer that it becomes painful to remember the disunion and the privation of Protestantism.' How *can* the Protestant Church have any authority with the world when every time it opens its mouth on any question, a perfect babel of voices comes forth? It is a sense of this need to escape from its contradictions, a sense that this confusion of voices must mean loss of influence and authority, which is inspiring most of the union movements of to-day. They are attempts to counteract the radical individualism into which we have fallen. But by external means one can expect to achieve only an external unity. Something deeper is needed. The true unity and the true fellowship is when we find ourselves standing shoulder to shoulder under the light of the same truth.

But how can we escape from our individualism and find our way back to each other that we may be bound together not by a mere bond of good fellowship but by a common bondage to the truth? How can the disintegration of Protestantism be stopped and the opposite process forwarded? A temporary expedient is useless, worse than useless, for it may lead us into a false security. The source of the trouble lies in the very nature of a church of men—that our truth is always mixed with untruth. The question of truth is the critical point in the life of the Church. The chief obstacle to Christianity is not the unbelief of the world, not the untruth of prevalent intellectual points of view, as much present-day theology presupposes, but the deficiency of *our* message and *our* principles in regard to Christian truth. The great achievement of Karl Barth is that he sets in the spade at this point and establishes theology as the indispensable function of the Church and its ministry. The only hope for the Church to escape from paralysing and demoralizing untruth is that ever afresh it should be bringing all things in its life and message under the light of God's word and submitting them to the most intense and searching critical scrutiny.

There are many who seem to fear that Barth is seeking to establish a new orthodoxy as the solution of these problems of Protestantism, and they fear the big stick of orthodoxy more than the dangers of unlimited individualism. A new orthodoxy would be irreconcilable with Barth's conception of the nature of theology. It is in the very nature of theology that it is always incomplete and must ever be starting afresh. There can never be a completed theology. All Barth asks of us is that we should cease to rest content in our individualism, that we should take seriously that there is such a thing as *the* Christian truth, and that our Church is a true Church only in so far as our truth is *the* Truth. When that point of view takes hold of a man, he *has* to work at theology as a sacred responsibility before God. To neglect it becomes an act of unfaithfulness in his office as a minister. When the history of the Church in the twentieth century is written, this alone would cause the name of Barth to mark a great turning-point, that through his work theology should have found its way back to its watch-tower over the Church's life.

◆

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Catching the Train.

By the Reverend John B. Davie, M.A., Leith.

'Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth.'—Ec 12[1].

I once knew a boy who lived in the country and travelled daily by train to and from school in the nearest city. Like many other young folk he was generally very loathe to go to bed at night, and as a result he often felt rather sleepy-headed and lazy in the morning, and had a tremendous scamper to be in time for his train. One morning he came panting on to the station platform just in time to see the train steaming out. 'Man, Jamie,' said the station-master, 'if you had run a bit harder, you'd have caught the train.' 'Oh,' replied Jamie, 'I ran hard enough, but I didn't start soon enough!'

Boys and girls, there is a railway called Life, and at the end of it there is a station called Success, and many people miss the train to Success, not because they don't run hard enough, but because they don't start soon enough to catch it. They dawdle and take things easy and waste the opportunities that come to them early in life, and find they can never in later life make up what they have lost. How many men I have met who have deplored to me that they did not take fuller advantage of their opportunities at school! They had worked hard, and got on so far in their calling, but found the way blocked to further promotion largely through lack of education or qualifications, and they wished, when it was too late, that they had 'stuck in' harder to their lessons at school.

I know there is an old proverb which says: 'It is never too late to mend.' That is a very blessed and comforting truth. Thank God, no matter how we have failed, it is never too late to mend our ways. But I venture to suggest that a thing which needs mending is never quite so good as a thing that has never been broken or spoiled. And, in any case, that proverb is one for older folk. Let me suggest a better proverb for you young people: 'It is never too soon to start right.' If you are to make a success of life, the sooner you begin to seek it, the more likely you will be to reach it. Therefore, make the most of your opportunities *now*! Work hard at school. Cultivate habits of diligence and thoroughness. Remember now . . . in the days of thy youth!

But here in church, boys and girls, we are reminded that there is another and finer kind of success than worldly success. Have you ever thought of this? A man may be a soldier, a sailor, or a candlestick-maker, or anything else—that to some extent is an accident of circumstances—but he can never be anything else than a man! And therefore his main task is to make a success of being a man! What does that mean? We learn that from Jesus Christ. He was the one perfect man who ever lived, and so the highest success we can attain in life is just to be Christlike in our character and life. But if we are to make our lives Christlike, it is never too soon to begin; for the longer we delay, the more firmly set we become in our habits of life; and if they are bad habits, the harder and more difficult it is to master them and to turn to better ways. And therefore, boys and girls, begin to serve Christ *now*. Don't say to yourself: 'There will be plenty of time to serve God later, when I grow older.' It is never too soon to start right. Give yourself into God's keeping *now*, and make up your mind to serve Him faithfully henceforth.

In the glad morning of my day,
My life to give, my vows to pay,
With no reserve and no delay,
With all my heart, I come.

Filaments.

By the Reverend R. A. Hardy, B.A.,
Blackley, Elland, Yorks.

'Ye shine as lights in the world.'—Ph 2[15].

Do you know what a filament is? If you look at a clear electric lamp when it is lit you will not forget very soon. For that brightly shining circle of wire in the bulb which gives out so brilliant a light is the filament of the lamp. You cannot bear to look at it for long, and as you turn your eyes away you must think how wonderful it is that so tiny a piece of wire should be able to light up a large room. Hour after hour it goes on gleaming. The word filament, according to the dictionary, comes from a Latin noun which means 'a thread' of cotton or wool. And that is what the first successful electric-light filament was—just a cotton thread.

The story of the invention of the electric lamp should inspire us, because it is a triumph of patience and endurance. The chief hero was the world-famous inventor, Thomas Edison. For a long time he had been in search of an inexpensive material which would give light when charged with electric current, and would not break easily. To-day we use thin metal wire, but in Edison's early life such wire was unknown. Some men who believed in the genius of the great inventor had raised a considerable sum of money to meet his expenses, and for twelve months he worked with little or no result. Many people turned against him, and some of his backers thought their money was lost. But Edison laughed back at his critics on 21st October 1879. On the day before, he twisted a piece of cotton thread into a horse-shoe shape, and sealed it in a glass bulb which was gradually exhausted of air. Then a current of electricity was passed through the filament. It glowed brightly! How long would it last? Thousands of other filaments, made of every conceivable substance, had only shone at the most for a few minutes. This fragile filament, however, was of a different sort. Hour after hour it gleamed forth through the night and into the next day, until it had attained forty hours of life. Thus was the first electric lamp born. Edison now tried to make the filament shine even more brightly, but in giving it more electric current he broke it. It is very amusing to read of the weird mixture of materials used by Edison in his search for a durable filament. Tissue-paper, horse-hair, silk, hemp, etc. Even hairs from a human head were tried. One of the assistants, of the name of Mackenzie, had a red beard, and several filaments were made from it. The hair filament burned brightly, but soon shrivelled up.

Now, a good filament is not necessarily the thickest or toughest. Everything depends on its being able to hold a high charge of electricity. And this is true of human beings also. Although we are weak, yet it is wonderful what good we can do and what help we can give, if only we can keep the power and love which our Lord Jesus gives to us. We have seen how soon some of Edison's filaments were burnt out. They shone wonderfully well, but only for a time. And some men and women, and boys and girls too, are like that. They get tired and give up. In the Bible Jesus speaks of good men as lamps illuminating the dark world. And we know that Jesus is the Light that lighteth all the world. So if we are to shine for Him, we must be filled with His spirit of love.

Lead lives of love; that others who
Behold your life may kindle too
With love, and cast their lot with you.

The Christian Year.

SEPTUAGESIMA.

Doing the Impossible.

'And Peter answered him and said, Lord, if it be thou, bid me come unto thee upon the waters. And he said, Come. And Peter went down from the boat, and walked upon the waters, to come to Jesus.'—Mt 14$^{28 \cdot 29}$ (R.V.).

The thing that holds our eye and grips our heart in this amazing story is the figure of Jesus riding the storm. This power-story fascinates us, because it so manifestly *is* an exhibition of power, explain it how we will. Also the element of sheer risk gives it added colour and piquancy, the utter abandonment of Jesus to a high way of living, and His complete regardlessness of the beaten paths of safety. But above and beyond all such considerations is the feeling it awakens in our minds that our Lord here is challenging us to rise with Him to another and higher type of life than the one we normally live. Tertullian long ago said of Jesus: 'He became what we are, in order that we might become what He is.' The feeling persists in our minds that this picture is not simply a unique and solitary display of exceptional power, but is really an acted parable of the type of thing a Christ-filled life should be.

That this is not a fanciful interpretation is clear from the reaction which the vision of Jesus awakened in Peter's mind. 'Bid me to come to thee *upon the waters*.' This request was not motived by his affection so much as by his spirit of adventure. He wanted to live his life on the same basis as Jesus. Who amongst us would not wish the same? And the life of Jesus, calm, strong, and adequate, as for one moment we glimpse it here battling successfully with the crude and colossal forces of Nature, as elsewhere with the forces of society, becomes for us the norm to which all adventurous hearts aspire. But how are we to get on to this power-level of life?

The first step in this overcoming life is *consciously to direct our wills towards Christ*. John Bunyan in a memorable phrase characterizes faith 'as a leap from the ladder blindfold into eternity.' Yet there is something defective in this definition, for the eyes of faith are not really bandaged. There are always present two elements in a genuine faith—seeing and following, perception and loyalty, intuition and courage. Peter's faith, as it exhibited itself here, was not a blindfold leap into the dark. He had the intuition that Christ was out there beyond him, on the waste of the heaving waters, waiting to welcome him. He was sure he had heard His voice, was certain he had seen His form. Even although that form was new and unfamiliar, it was that vision that called forth his faith. He not only saw, he resolutely followed where he saw. It is at this point that most people become limp and hang back.

'It is an enterprise,' says Clement, 'it is an enterprise of noble daring to take our way to God.' Look what it meant in Peter's case. His initial act of faith was, to use a phrase of Kierkegaard's, 'a desperate sortie.' Peter was an experienced fisherman, and he knew the terror of the sea. It was, indeed, an enterprise of noble daring to step out of the comparative safety of his boat, and walk in the darkest part of the night into a boiling sea, and into the teeth of a tempestuous gale.

How many of us have the courage to face up to the demands of a faith like this? Are we prepared to give up our fancied securities, and commit ourselves to a risky and uncertain course of life? Are we prepared to leave the familiar and face the unknown with Christ? Are we willing to step off the material basis of life, the basis of prudence, expediency and human calculation, and step out on to the spiritual basis of life, relying on no arm of flesh for support but on Christ alone.

The second point is to *realize that this daring and adventurous type of life is precisely the life to which Christ calls us.* 'Bid me to come to thee upon the waters,' said Peter, and Christ said, 'Come!' The commentators on the whole are less than just to Peter in their interpretation of his motives for acting as he did. They are disposed to look on this request of Peter's as a gratuitous display of swagger and presumption, and they interpret Christ's invitation as designed to teach a foolishly reckless disciple a salutary lesson on the folly of overweening ambition. But surely such an interpretation is quite alien to the method of Jesus.

When Jesus says, 'Come!' He means us to come. He put all His heart behind that invitation to Peter, and nothing disappointed Him more than Peter's failure to come all the way.

Jesus loved the man who was prepared to play big stakes for His sake. He would have subscribed to the sentiment of R. L. Stevenson, 'Life is an affair of cavalry, a thing to be dashingly used and cheerfully hazarded.' Like the Psalmist He would have said: 'I hate a man who is half and half.' He loved adventurous and even reckless natures that spilled the red wine of life in prodigal love and selfless devotion at His feet.

Professor Joseph McFadyen draws attention to our Lord's fondness for the word 'all'—'giving all,' 'forsaking all,' 'sacrificing all,' 'loving with all the heart, mind, and strength.' His great men and women are those who flung everything into the scales on His side—the widow who flung all she had into the treasury, the pearl merchant who sold all that he had, Peter who forsook all his friends and his security for the privilege of going to Christ on the water. This spirit of utter abandonment of self and goods to causes and spiritual values supremely worth while appealed to Jesus, because it was akin to His own nature. His was a giving life, and when He gave, He gave with both hands freely. He kept nothing back, not even His life. 'This is my body,' He said, 'and it is broken for you, my blood and it is shed for you.'

The third point to notice is *the astonishing success of the venture of faith.* We must not allow Peter's temporary failure to cloud for us our appreciation of his achievement. So long as he lived his life on a supernatural basis he was gloriously equal to all the forces arrayed against him. He only failed when he slipped off that basis on to the nature level. Dr. Fosdick quotes the penetrating observation of an American journalist: 'There are plenty of people to do the possible. You can hire them at forty dollars a week. But the prizes of life go to those who can do the impossible. If a thing can be done, experience and skill will do it. If a thing can't be done, only faith can do it.'

Emerson says: 'They can conquer who believe they can.' That claim needs qualification. To be sure there is a large measure of truth in it. There are powers resident in the human will that have never been exploited. The amazements of history are the achievements of men like Napoleon Bonaparte, who carved their way to fame and power through an indomitable faith in themselves. But no degree of self-confidence will ever give us power to do the humanly impossible. Peter with all his self-confidence could not walk on the water. He could swim through the water, and on another occasion he actually did take this method of reaching his Master, but he could not walk on the water, with all the self-confidence in the world. Well, here he is doing the impossible thing, and he is doing it, not because he believes in himself, but because he believes in Christ.

Faith is the faculty by which we tap the resources of God, and the limits of faith are set, not by our personal exertions, but by our capacity to appropriate the power of God. If we believed in Christ enough, we should do the impossible too. That is the measure of the task that we, as Christians, are set in the world to do. We are here to do impossible things, to attempt impossible tasks, to bring to pass impossible results. 'All things are possible to him that believeth.'

One word of appeal to those whose lives are not lived on a faith-basis. Let us see that we do not put the challenge of this incident lightly aside, as if it were something that did not concern us. On the contrary, it is a matter of grave concern, because our response to this challenge determines our way of living. Life is not a matter of choice, it is a relentless necessity. Whether believers or not, we must face its imperious demands. Of necessity we must make the same voyage over the same waters. The journey is not a matter of choice, it is only the way that we travel that is.

We are living in troubled and unquiet times. Forces dark, inscrutable, and sinister are gathering on the horizon. Even the boat to which we cling offers no sure security. At any moment a great sea wave, some sudden cataclysm, may destroy it and overwhelm us. All our material securities, the things that stand between us and the ultimate disaster, are of the flimsiest kind. The only real question that faces us is how we are to fare through that inky darkness and across that risky way? The Christian policy is to capture the secret of riding the waves with Christ. It is to dispense entirely with the use of the boat, and in the illuminating phrase of Walt Whitman: 'To make friends of the winds and the weather.' This victory over circumstances, this conquest of the world and all its forces, this independence of all security except the security of God are given only to those who, like Peter, venture all for Christ and count the world well lost for His sake.[1]

Sexagesima.

The Presence of the Absence of God.

'Out of the depths have I cried unto thee, O Lord. Lord, hear my voice: let thine ears be attentive to the voice of my supplications.'—Ps 130$^{1, 2}$.

Chesterton says somewhere that there is a great difference between the absence of the presence of God and the presence of the absence of God. This sounds like a jingling trick of words, but it is seldom safe to dismiss Chesterton at that. I think he is distinguishing between complacency and hunger; between our human eagerness to justify and save ourselves and the spirit which has nothing to say except, 'If thou, O Lord, shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand?' but which still can look expectantly to God, hoping in His word. It is the difference between the man who preens himself in view of his achievement, polishing each leaf of his gathered laurels, and Isaac Newton confessing at the end of his life that he had gathered only a few pebbles on the shores of truth; or St. Paul, strong and sweet and spiritual, writing to the Philippians, 'I count not myself to have apprehended; but this one thing I do, forgetting the things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.' Complacency is 'the absence of the presence of God': hunger is 'the presence of the absence of God,' and contains the promise of life and growth and satisfaction.

Karl Barth and his followers have done our generation the distinguished service of pressing home with power the truth that what we call 'religion' or 'religious experience' is always in danger of lying on the wrong side of this contrast. The cardinal sin of man is pride, the refusal to acknowledge his deep, constitutional sinfulness and to undergo the experience of being pardoned, and consenting to live in the state, so unthinkable to self-will, of entire submission to the Divine will. Man wants at all costs to justify himself. This is a central motive of humanism in all its varied manifestations, even the most idealistic of them; but, according to Barth's analysis, it is equally the motive of much of what passes for religion. In one camp Christ is acclaimed as the product of the human race, worn like a feather in the cap of humanity, or carried like a flag or mascot in the van of idealistic enterprise. But the individual man who resolves to be Christlike does not always impress his neighbour with Christlikeness. The 'Christian' nations, proclaiming aloud their desire and intention to have done with war, occupy themselves at Geneva with months of dialectics, and go home to re-arm. It is one thing to take Christ's teaching as the last word in human idealism: it is another thing to recognize in Christ's teaching the revealed will of the Lord of heaven and earth.

In another camp the whole traditional scheme of Christian faith (including, of course, a belief in the divinity of Christ) is taken bodily over into the control of men, translated week by week into appropriately solemn rites and discourses and practices, managed by men, and by men harnessed to the chariot of the world's need, as men understand that need. But in all this there may be no surrender of human egotism; the whole transaction may be conducted on a horizontal plane on which men retain their assurance and self-will. For all their multiplied labours and organized campaigns, the Churches do not actually transmit salvation to mankind or make the wilderness to blossom like the rose. They did not prevent the War, nor are they leading the nations with any obvious authority into the reality of reconciliation. It is one thing to take over the traditional Christian formulas, expounding them and seeking to insert them like a mainspring into the mechanism of the world's life—over all which human operations there must still be written, 'the absence of the presence of God': it is another thing, and not within the power of men and Churches, to be born again and to be commissioned and enabled by the Spirit of God.

---

[1] R. Menzies, *The Magnet of the Heart*, 131.

Near the ruins of the Border abbeys you may see, built into the walls of comfortable little dwelling-houses, fragments of carved stones which once formed part of the sacred edifice. Here it may be a lintel inscribed with a text from the Vulgate, there a corbel in the form of a pomegranate or a bunch of foliage. Is that not a symbol of what much modern religion has done with Christianity? It has taken this little fragment of doctrine and that little piece of artistic ritual, and fitted them into an essentially human scheme of living, but it has lost the sense of the transcendent God whose prerogative it is to be obeyed, and in whose will alone is our peace and security. The most hopeful sign of our times is that we are beginning to suspect that a man-made civilization is not so secure as it sometimes looks, even when it salutes Christ with a show of deference.

'I wait for the Lord, my soul doth wait, and in his word do I hope. My soul waiteth for the Lord more than they that watch for the morning.' This Psalmist had learned three lessons which men and Churches have to learn over and over again.

First, he had learned to realize the darkness and danger of his situation in view of the holiness of God. He compares himself to a watcher by night, let us say to a military sentry. When a sentry stands at the head of a sap and looks out into the eerie darkness, there is not much danger of his mistaking his real situation nor of his settling down to comfortable musings about human life and destiny. He knows his personal peril and his personal responsibility. Do you think that vitality will ever come back to religion before religion recovers a piercing sense of the fear of God? Shortly before he died, William James congratulated his contemporaries that they were able to pass from the cradle to the grave without knowing the meaning of fear. Can we corroborate that verdict to-day?

Secondly, the Psalmist, crying to God in his distress and anxiety, learned that God speaks and can be heard by men who listen intently. I remember once taking out a platoon of a Training Reserve Battalion on night-exercises. We marched out into a large field, halted, and for a few minutes stood in the blackness of a very dark night, listening quietly. When the men were asked what they had heard, there was brisk answering, for the exercise was novel and a welcome change from the monotonies of the barrack-square. All had heard the bark of a dog and the rumbling of a belated lorry; some had heard the movements of another platoon in the next field, and so forth. At length, a country-bred lad made the astonishing statement, 'I heard the sound of running water about ten yards away.' Yes, it was true: a practised ear had detected, and it was possible for all now to detect the sound of a runlet which had its course beneath a hedge and spoke with a quiet, continuous voice. Once it had been heard, the gentle sound of that unhurrying water seemed to be the very voice of the night itself. There is a voice of God which speaks to men who hunger and thirst after righteousness. It does not cry aloud above the noises of the world; it has to be listened for in quietness and intentness of spirit. That word of God to man is Christ—not the Jesus of the humanists, the projection into history of their own idealisms—but the Christ of God, risen and ascended, constraining and commanding, judging men and offering them His terrible gift of pardon.

Lastly, having heard the word of God, the Psalmist learned the meaning of faith and dared to believe all things and hope all things. 'Let Israel hope in the Lord: for with the Lord there is mercy, and with him is plenteous redemption.' How should we not hope all things, if the word which God speaks is the word of pardon? How should we not believe all things, if Cross and Resurrection and Ascension are God's word to the sinful world?[1]

QUINQUAGESIMA

On Believing in the Love of God.

'And we have known and believed the love that God hath to us.'—1 Jn 4^{16}.

But have we? We may know the story of God's great love in word and deed, but have we *believed* it? Are we living as if we did?

Some natures find it hard at times to believe in the affection even of their best friends. So strong a character as George Eliot, for example, was not exempt from this weakness. She writes to one of her close friends: 'I can't help losing belief that people love me—the unbelief is in my nature, and no sort of fork will drive it finally out.'

---

[1] A. C. Craig, *University Sermons*, 59.

Choice spirits who give a lead to others have 'this rare faculty not only of "supposing" and "inclining to think," but of knowing and believing.' So we read in our Carlyle, and when Carlyle wrote this he had been reading life. Convictions are more effective than mere opinions, and convictions imply a ripe insight which is not dependent upon hearsay or any indirect touch with reality. What furnishes stimulus as well as steadying confidence within the Church is the presence of people who are able to say, *We have known and believed*, not simply 'we incline to think,' or 'we suppose.' Sometimes we do not know what we believe; we may well have less faith than we imagine that we possess, or perhaps more faith than we think. Again, the true quality of our belief is not always what we assume it to be. No, it is one mark of sensible people to know what they really believe, but it is also a note of moral health to believe in what we know, that is, to live by our convictions; for who can expect to be sound or vital in religion if he is not putting what he knows about God into action and application, daring to put it to the touch? Therefore, as we value religious sincerity and effectiveness, we had better be asking ourselves, 'Do I know and believe God's love, or is it little more than vague hearsay than an abstract idea?' We say occasionally that we have a working knowledge of some subject, meaning that, while we do not pretend to understand all its details and technique, we do know enough of it to make it a working power in our ordinary life. Now the goodwill of God has issues and methods that are mysterious, sometimes terribly mysterious: in this world we can only hope to have some working knowledge of His love. But the question is, Have we even that?

In the first place, we may make it difficult for ourselves to believe in God's love if we neglect the supreme proof of it in the Lord Jesus Christ. It is all very well to cry, with Browning—

'God! Thou art love! I build my faith on that.'

But 'that' is itself a faith which requires to be built on something deeper, and what is that deeper foundation but the redeeming purpose of God manifested in the Lord Jesus? His life is the interpretation and proof of God's love, as nothing else can be. And whenever this core and centre of our religion is forgotten or undervalued, the result before very long is an uncertainty about the love of God, an uncertainty that spreads till it renders people weak and vague and sentimental, even with the unsentimental New Testament in their hands.

Then selfishness weakens the sense of God's love. Our faith in a sense depends upon our life. We really cannot believe higher than we behave. He that loveth not knoweth not God, for God is love. When we allow ourselves to slip into unforgiving habits of intercourse, into a cynical or uncharitable temper, or into any ungenerous attitude, when we fail in plain duty and service to our fellows, we are destroying the power of believing in love altogether. A mist rises from the low marshes of preoccupation with ourselves which clouds our vision of God's love. For how can that love be in any sense real to us if brotherly love is not a reality?

But, even apart from all this, it is frequently a strain to believe in God's love when we encounter in our own lives or in the lives of others some of the tragic, staggering facts of the world. Even the dutiful and innocent meet things that seem to deny outright any love divine. We remember in *Hamlet* how Laertes finds his sister driven insane by cruelty, and how, listening to the poor girl raving, he cries aloud, 'Do you see this, O God?'

The love God has—in our shaking world, in our desperate poverty, in our empty homes, in our broken hopes, in our incurable diseases, in our crushed affections. *The love God has?*

Yes, *the love, the love God has for us*. For He has not changed. We may perhaps help ourselves to believe in His goodwill by falling back upon two considerations which have often helped to rally the uneasy. The first is, that His love is not mere fondness, but alive with a moral purpose, and that if He denies us something it may be because we shall be the stronger for doing without it. Then, again, we need to bethink ourselves that what happens to ourselves is part of a wise, large order extending over all the world—a mysterious order which goes beyond our individual intelligence.

Such considerations do not avail to answer all our questions. But surely they help to persuade some of us, in our dismay and resentment, to take the larger view that the Lord may not have forgotten to be gracious.

Marcus Aurelius, the Roman Emperor, sets down in the first part of his diary what he owed to the influence of this person and of that in his life; among other items he notes this: 'From my brother Severus I learned to cherish good hope and to believe in the love of my friends.' Have we not to learn the same kind of lesson that the pagan saint learned, and to learn it here and now in relation to our God as well as to our friends? If it be weak and even silly to let ourselves become incredulous about the loyalty of friends, if it is unreasonable to distrust an affection which cannot always be expressing itself, is it not equally morbid to be uncertain about our God, when prayer for a time seems to be unheard, or when we cry out into what appears to be a silent, empty universe? Shall we not venture to believe that His purpose still holds good? In fact, is that not what we are really doing when we repeat the Lord's Prayer? For, as we pray that prayer in the spirit of the Lord, we are not calling upon God to fulfil some duties which we are afraid He may be likely to forget; it is not to remind Him of His responsibilities, but rather to remind ourselves of what He has surely promised to do for us and with us in the fellowship of His Son. We say 'Our Father,' to inspire our confidence anew in His purpose of good.

There are inconceivable things in this world, plenty of them, but surely for us, inside God's household and order, the most inconceivable would be that, after all that has passed between Him and us, He has for some reason lost interest in His children and creatures. We can believe much, but not that—no, not for a second!

Hold to it, then, hold to it as a fixed point, without any ifs or buts, that His sure purpose is not proved to have broken down. They do tell us, in some corners of our knowing, sceptical generation, that such religious belief is 'the most empty and pretentious of notions,' a 'mere form of neurosis,' no more substantial than a rainbow that plays prettily over the plunging cataracts of human heartbreak and agony in this loveless, godless universe. That we know, they tell us, that we believe. So be it. But they are wasting their wisdom if they try to lecture men and women out in the open, who, whatever sights daunt them, see the Cross of Christ with the life that led up to it and the life that streamed from it, the life that still streams from it, into any wilderness that human beings make for themselves by doubt and disobedience. Their testimony is otherwise; it is, that at this time of day we are not acting unreasonably or presumptuously when we look up out of any bleak, bare place and tell ourselves, 'God is mindful of us, God will continue to take care of us, come what may.' And this is no solitary faith. We are not saying it for the first time, and we never say it alone. Join them, for they are a great and growing company, join those who are wise enough and brave enough to confess, 'We have known and believed the love God hath to us'—even to us, and even to-day.[1]

First Sunday in Lent.

Our Lord's Temptations—and Ours.

By the Reverend Harry Q. Macqueen, M.A., Forest Gate, London.

'One that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.'—He 4[15] (R.V.).

The late Dr. Stalker once asked a company of young men whom he was to address what subject he should deal with, and received the reply: 'There is only one subject worth speaking to young men about, and that is temptation.' That was, of course, an overstatement, but did indicate a sense of the vital importance of the subject, which is, indeed, one that profoundly concerns everybody. The temptations of age differ from those of youth, but no one entirely escapes from the furnace of trial so long as he wears the garment of mortality. This is a warfare from which there is no discharge. And temptations are innumerable in variety, being closely interwoven with people's characters, temperaments, and circumstances. What is a strong temptation to one is no temptation at all to another, nor are we subject to the same temptations at different stages of our development.

That our Lord Himself was subject to temptation should save us from despair when we are sore beset and imagine ourselves outcast from the way of purity and goodness. When evil suggestions arise in our minds, or when we are tempted to trifle with truth, or to turn from the rugged path of duty to languorous ease, we should recall that Jesus, our Lord, was 'tempted of the devil.' Even He, the Pure and Holy One, had to fight such battles. Therefore, clearly, temptation is not in itself sinful; it only becomes sin when coquetted with, embraced, unresisted. St. Augustine described the progress of temptation as 'a thought, a picture, a fascination, a fall.' Sin enters in at the second stage when we dwell, with pleasant dalliance, on the suggestion which has arisen in the mind.

The inward spiritual struggle endured by our Lord at the outset of His public ministry is generally called 'The Temptation,' but it must be remembered that it was only one of His temptations, as the Evangelist indicates in the words—'the devil departed from him for a season.'

Our Lord, who alone could have given His followers the account of this inward struggle, clothed it in vivid, pictorial language; but the graphic imagery must not blind us to the reality of the struggle. Such struggles are always intensely lonely—always 'in the wilderness,'—and always fierce—'with the wild beasts.' And the *time* is also significant. Assaults of temptation may come when least expected; that is part of their subtlety. The attack does not always come in an hour of conscious weakness, when one might be on one's guard; often it comes in the train of some great hour of the soul. This outstanding temptation of our Lord followed hard on the assurance of Divine approval at His baptism. Happy are they who have armour, prepared beforehand, instantly available against sudden attack, who can fall back on some sure word of God. 'It is written . . .' There often lies the secret of victory.

---

[1] J. Moffatt, *His Gifts and Promises*, 234.

The circumstances of this particular set of temptations seem to have been these. Jesus—prepared through 'the silent years,' by communion with Nature, by the discipline of a lowly home, by intercourse with His fellows in carpenter's shop and village street, and by meditation on the teachings of the Law and Prophets—was now conscious of an urge to go forth and proclaim the message of the Kingdom which burned within Him. But, being truly man, who must reach his decisions through travail of soul, He saw not clearly, as yet, the best way of accomplishing His mission. Could He accomplish it by alliance with one of the existing parties? He passes in review the prevalent systems of the time, feels their allurement (and we may admit that there was much of good in them, while remembering that the corruption of the good is the worst), and then resolutely puts them, one by one, aside, and starts on a lonelier and more weary road which led to victory for the cause of God, but only by the way of Calvary. The rejection of the other ways, in spite of what they had to offer, was His victory in the Temptation.

The leading parties of that time were the Sadducees, the Pharisees, and the Herodians, and they were much more than merely political parties, and sought to influence more profoundly the lives of those who adhered to them. They might be compared with present-day Fascism, which seeks to dominate life in a way that older parties did not attempt to do; or with Communism, which is for many people a religion as well as a political and economic system.

In considering the party of the Sadducees, Jesus would notice that stress was placed on the survival of the nation, which would be a good thing if the nation were to remain true to her high destiny, conserving those great religious values for which she had testified and suffered throughout her chequered history, and being 'a light to lighten the Gentiles' as prophets had conceived her mission. But mere national survival, while surrendering religious vocation, our Lord would regard as a seduction of evil; and this was what, in practice, Sadduceeism had come to stand for. As Stephen Liberty says: 'The possession of the Temple and the whole religious heritage of the nation were an asset, not for the winning of the world for Jehovah, nor even for the establishment of an independent theocracy, but for the glorification and enrichment of a few ruling families.' In figurative language, 'bread,' merely material sustenance, was what the Sadducees had come to stand for; therefore Jesus resolutely put from Him the idea of working with or through them, with the words: 'Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word which proceedeth out of the mouth of God.'

But could He work with the larger and more popular sect of the Pharisees? These people did believe in the national vocation; they held that God's people should be separate and holy; they demanded strict obedience to the Law, and were eager proselytizers. They read, though not understandingly, the Messianic prophecies. Jesus realized that they might wish Him, if He cast in His lot with them, to accept the rôle of Messiah, as others had done. This spectacular method—doing something dramatic of their own devising, and expecting God to approve and confirm it—was really 'tempting God,' that is, devising tests for Him. 'Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God' was the answer of Jesus to this temptation.

There was yet another party, the Herodians, which might conceivably be the instrument with which He could work. Could He fulfil His vocation as 'Son of God' by alliance with them? Stating it briefly and crudely, the Herodian policy was that of worldly common sense: it was the policy of compromise. The Herods were attempting to weld Gentile populations together, under nominally Jewish sway, by an alliance with Rome, the price of which was a tacit recognition of heathen gods. Jesus rejected with scorn the thought of such compromise—'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and *him only* shalt thou serve.'

In some such way did our Lord consider the appeal of the various parties of His day, and He rejected each in turn as He noted the temptation inherent in it. To strive to fulfil His calling through one or other of those parties would have been the easy way, since it is always easier to make use of what is at hand than to be a pioneer. But He saw the snares—neglect of the nation's true destiny; 'tempting God' in the sense of seeking to compel (as it were) His intervention; and worldly compromise—and so to adhere to any of these parties, as a means to attaining His end, appeared to Him a temptation of the devil. He, therefore, rejected the allurement of these parties, and went forward on that long and lonely road that led past the Tree to the Triumph.

And because *He* had to face life in lonely agony of soul, feeling the fascination of lower ways and rejecting them, though they might seem to lead more quickly to the goal, we, in our trial hours, may be sure of understanding and of aid. 'We have not a high priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but one that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.' Wherefore, *Sursum corda !*

The Authority of the Bible To-day.

By the Reverend Hedley Hodkin, M.A., Morpeth.

In seeking to persuade either a jury or a political meeting, the speaker, whether barrister or statesman, has to consider not only the cogency of his reasoning and the best method of presenting the facts, but equally the mental powers, habits, and prejudices of those to whom he speaks. In inquiring how we may lead the men and women of our generation to an acceptance of the authority of the Bible, we must not only be able to explain clearly in what that authority consists, but we must understand some of the characteristics of what is called 'the modern mind.'

'The modern mind'—not in general or in the abstract, but that mind as it approaches and views religion—how can it be explained ? It is sceptical, credulous, critical of organized religion, full of reverence for science and the scientific method—but the characteristic which concerns us most here is this—it is a generation which has lost the sense of God and of a spiritual world. The cause of this fading of the consciousness of God from the life of our time is not far to seek or difficult to explain. We are living towards the end of one of the most exciting and sensational eras of scientific progress and change in the history of mankind. For four thousand years the economic life of man hardly changed at all. All that our great-great-grandfathers knew of science and of engineering in the eighteenth century was known to the ancient Greeks and Romans. Then within a few generations the whole face of the world and the economic bases of life were fundamentally changed by the development of machinery, engineering, and scientific knowledge and method. Now, it is a psychological fact of human life that the range of man's interest and attention is limited. Charles Darwin, for instance, confessed sorrowfully towards the end of a life of austere and noble devotion to scientific study that 'he could not endure to read a line of poetry, that Shakespeare nauseated him,' and that he lost all taste for music and pictures—to the consciously felt impoverishment of his life. Similarly our generation has been so dazzled and fascinated by the achievements of science that it has not been able to give attention and thought to the spiritual world, with the result that the sense of this other and higher world has been lost. As F. J. A. Hort pointed out over sixty years ago, 'Everywhere we have offered to us a higher world and a lower. The lower world is always the most tangible, obtrusive, alluring. The higher world is always the most impalpable, secluded, severe.'[1] Happily, however, we are said to be near the end of this era of scientific advance, and, like children too long engrossed with their own toys and amusements, we are beginning to look around and to be aware of another, a wider, deeper life around and above us.

By one of the ironies of history this age of scientific advance coincided with times of great intellectual and spiritual poverty in the life of the Church. In the earlier part of the nineteenth century, apart from the great Cambridge school of Coleridge, Julius Charles Hare and Frederick Denison Maurice, the Church in England was quite unequal to the demands of the new age, clung suspiciously to outworn forms of belief, and regarded science and the new knowledge as an enemy. At this time the scientific method of study applied to the books of the Old and New Testaments shattered the old view of the authority of the Bible, but the insight and courage to put a better one in its place were lacking. The position to-day is this—just as the mind of our generation is beginning to feel after God and to realize the need for religion, it feels perplexed, uneasy, uncertain about the Bible. Has not the Bible been 'disproved' by science, is the

[1] *The Way, the Truth, the Life*, 161.

question asked. If we cannot believe the story of Creation, if we cannot respect the character of the Patriarchs, if we cannot find accurate prognostications of the future in the prophets, nor direct and detailed guidance for our lives in the Gospels, what is there left to seek?

The true, emancipating, inspiring view of the meaning of the Bible—as expounded for instance by Professor Dodd in *The Authority of the Bible*, must be set forth clearly and unequivocally. It is true, we must explain, and we are grateful for it, the Bible does not possess external infallible authority which we are required to accept without questioning or the testing of experience. If authority is thought of as the power to enforce that kind of obedience, then the Bible has none such. Even if what was held to be the teaching of the Bible were to be enforced by some external human authority, whether of Church or State, that would not be to vindicate or secure the authority of the Bible, but merely to compel a slavish and irreligious conformity to external precepts. The authority which the Bible has, it has simply and solely as a revelation of truth, and, as Professor Dodd insists, 'authority in the absolute sense resides in the Truth alone, or, in religious language, in the mind and will of God. In so far as the Bible possesses authority in religion, it can only be as mediating the truth, or as the Word of God.'[1] Our age has a great respect for fact and truth, and in claiming for truth this final and ultimate authority over our minds we should win instant agreement. We should go on to claim for the Bible that it reveals two truths, or rather two aspects of the one truth—namely, the truth about human life and the truth about God.

What is the truth concerning human life which the Bible reveals?—that our human life is not self-sufficient, self-sustaining, and self-redeeming, but that it lives by and needs communion with God. 'Man shall not live by bread alone but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.' 'Whom have I in Heaven but Thee and there is none upon earth that I desire beside Thee. My flesh and my heart faileth, but God is the strength of my heart and my portion for evermore.' This is the central conviction of the Bible and the fact which it everywhere insists upon and attests. In the Bible we see human life stretching from the dawn of history to the first century of our era, human life under the most varied conditions and meeting the most varied experience, yet always aspiring towards, seeking after, and conscious of its need of the Eternal world. Whether it is primitive man wandering in deserts or tilling the land, civilized man living in cities, trading, building, fighting, writing, thinking, always and everywhere he shows this constant characteristic, he looks beyond this world of sense and time and reaches out after God. This history of human life suggests inevitably that while animals find all that they need in a purely this-worldly environment, man has been given and has developed powers and capacities which can find no full satisfaction in the life of sensation and appetite, and which, so far from making him contented and at home in this world, disable him in it. Human life, for instance, has conscience with its knowledge of right and wrong, its intolerable remorse, remorse which only the forgiveness of God can remove; it has depth and tenderness of love which cannot endure the thought of death apart from the knowledge of ternal life; it has a power of memory and imagination which make life a nightmare of fear and terror until the love and care of God are known and trusted.[2] When this deep need of human life for a living relationship with and knowledge of the unseen is ignored or forgotten—the Bible would teach us—life is eccentric, abnormal, unhealthy. When the mind and heart of man live and rest in God, then they reach the greatest fullness of joy and meaning of which they are capable.

The second truth which the Bible reveals is the truth concerning the Being and Nature of God. The Bible is the story, as we have seen, of man aspiring and groping, but still more it is the book which unfolds that spontaneous self-disclosure of the Divine, that unveiling of the mind and heart of God, which we call Revelation. Immeasurably deeper and far more important than man's seeking for God is the Divine search for man, and the Bible is the history of that search. At the heart of this world is an infinitely wise and holy love whom we call Father, a love which counts the hairs of our head, notices the fall of a single sparrow, a love which forgives our iniquities and heals our diseases, a love which does not remain in selfish isolation in some dim and serene Eternity, but which from the beginning of time has been ever seeking to communicate life, love, its very self to man, a love which called and spoke to the prophets and to the psalmists, and which in the life of Jesus became incarnate and took flesh for us. The Bible is the book which describes this cardinal event in the life of mankind, this supreme sign and sacrament of the love which seeks—the Incarnation of the Son of God.

The Bible offers these two twin truths to us, the truth about life and the truth about God. It does not call upon us to accept them merely because they stand written or because some one else has said that we ought to, but to verify and prove them for ourselves. If experience and testing bears out and establishes these truths, if the acceptance of them gives to heart and mind that joy, power, and repose which only truth can give, then the authority of the Bible is vindicated. This authority is now seen to be essentially propædeutic; that is, it places men in the right attitude for forming a judgment and puts the true facts before them. However great the probability that we shall agree with and accept this authority, however certain it is that the evidence for the highest truth 'is to be found in the light which it brings, far more than in any light which it receives'[1] the obligation to test it remains.

---

[1] *The Authority of the Bible*, 289.

[2] Cf. Farmer, *Things Not Seen*, 13 f.

We have noticed some of the characteristics of the mind of this generation, we have considered what the Bible is and in what its authority consists, it remains to inquire explicitly what is meant by leading the men and women of our generation to an acceptance of the authority of the Bible, and how it is to be done. It is certainly not sufficient to persuade them to hold the correct view of Biblical inspiration, to give a purely speculative assent to the general teaching of modern criticism. We should not be content to leave the modern man believing that the Bible reveals religious truth in the same way in which he believes that there is a Sultan of Zanzibar, or that the Quantum Theory is an established fact of science. By accepting the authority of the Bible we mean that he should not only read and study but live in the revelation given there, until the awakened soul hears God speaking, responds and gives heart, soul, and mind to Him. Our aim is not to lead men and women to argue about the Bible or to accept the latest critical views of this or that book in it, but to read it, to understand it, and to see in it the offer of Eternal Life.

A political correspondent of one of the large daily papers recently criticised the debating methods of a Cabinet Minister in this way—the Minister was said to be in the habit of employing every argument that came into his head instead of concentrating on one or two of the strongest. In persuading men to read the Bible we must use, not every argument that we can think of, but only our strongest, and it is this—the Bible is the book, the only book, in which we can learn about the life and mind of Jesus. 'For the Christian Faith the Scriptures are a unity—at bottom the Old Testament and the New Testament have only one Word of God to proclaim, and that is the message of Christ Himself.' 'The Bible is the crib in which Christ lies.'[2] Our generation, with its blindness and deafness to the spiritual world, is difficult to approach with a religious message, but it offers a very promising and hopeful avenue here—it is interested in and fascinated by the Incarnate life of Christ. It is not exaggeration to say that more is known to-day about the Life lived under those Syrian skies than in any age or generation since the days of the Apostles, that more lives and books about Him have been written in the last fifty years than in the previous five hundred. Taking advantage of this new knowledge and of this awakened interest, this—in some such words—should be our method of persuasion and approach.

There is much in the Bible which is difficult to understand and much that is not relevant to life to-day, but it does tell us about the life and mind and about the death and resurrection of Jesus. Knowledge of Him is the most precious and necessary knowledge that there is. Let us read the Bible at first, then, for no other reason than to know Him.

His life in the Gospels has been compared to a night sky, 'the longer you gaze at it the greater the multitude of the stars.'[3] As the 'blinding rheum of familiarity' is washed from your eyes by reading and reflecting, a Figure will come before you alive, arresting, original, and beautiful beyond our three dimensional æsthetic and moral standards. You will find yourself wondering at the depth, power, and simplicity of His mind, at the range of His extempore parables, at His swift and conclusive replies, at His appealing humour. You will wonder still more when you see how amazingly His mind stands out above and beyond the mind of His contemporaries and of the ages—in His attitude, for instance, towards women and children, and towards Nature. Even St. Paul hardly follows Him here—close disciple though he was—for he can still regard women as inferior to men, he doubts whether God cares for oxen, and misses Christ's attitude towards children (a child, to St. Paul, is an immature adult, not a member of the Kingdom of Heaven). If you find yourself wondering at His mind you will be amazed and awestruck at His character. Like His garments on the Mount of Transfiguration, it shines with an unearthly radiance and loveliness. The complete absence of self-consciousness, the deep compassion, the tender pity, the responsiveness to the needs and conveniences of others, the mercifulness towards publicans and sinners, the gentleness to little children, the love even unto death, the immeasurable power held in reserve—these qualities speak home to our hearts, they exercise authority over us, they constrain love, adoration, worship.

---

[1] F. J. A. Hort, *The Authority of the Bible*, 11.

[2] E. Brunner, *The Mediator*, Eng. tr., 172.

[3] Merezkovsky, *Jesus the Unknown*, 17.

Begin then, our persuasions will continue, with the Gospels, with St. Mark and its vivid life-like touches, its infinitely loving detail, St. Matthew with its massive unity and careful recollections of the words of Jesus, 'the most powerful, the most beautiful, the most superhuman words ever uttered in human language,' St. Luke with its portrayal of the gentleness and compassion of Christ, St. John with its depth and richness of meaning, 'Love's memory of Love Incarnate with the marks of a great devotion writ plainly upon it.'[1] After the Gospels you will be led on naturally and inevitably to read the Epistles, for you will wish to understand the significance of that life and its creativeness in the lives of others. Then, realising 'that the Old Testament is the dictionary of the New Testament,'[2] you will want to read the Psalmists and Prophets, for they will all help you to understand Him. As you read, and go on reading, the Bible will—to use the vivid phrase of S. T. Coleridge—find you at deeper and deeper levels of your being until you will be convinced and sure that the Bible has the authority which is claimed for it.

The Cambridge Bible for Little Children does not begin with Genesis, with Patriarchs, Prophets and Kings, but with the life of Jesus, with what He did and taught. Then, under the chapter heading, 'Stories that Jesus would read and know,' it gives extracts from the Old Testament. Our method with adults must follow the same road. As it is only in Christ that can be found 'the power to persuade a sinner to return, to bring home a heart to God,'[3] so only in Him is the power to persuade us sinners to read and to accept the authority of the Bible.

---

[1] Cf. C. E. Raven, *Jesus and the Gospel of Love*.

[2] *The Life of F. D. Maurice*, i. 107.

[3] Leighton, quoted S. T. Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection* (Bohn's edition), 104.

Contributions and Comments.

The Parable of the Unjust Steward (Luke xvi. 1 ff.).

C. H. Dodd, in his recent study *The Parables of the Kingdom* (p. 29), speaks of this parable as 'very difficult,' and notes that to it 'the Evangelist has appended a whole series of morals.' This is in illustration of his previous statement that 'there are grounds for suspecting that in many cases the application was not part of the earlier tradition, but was supplied by the Evangelist, or by his immediate authority, representing no doubt the current exegesis in that part of the Church to which he belonged.' The present note examines the second of these morals, rather than the parable itself, because it is extraordinarily difficult to understand in the mouth of Jesus, and hardly less so as primitive exegesis. Indeed, it is this v.[9] which seems to have cast the shadow of its own obscurity over the story it is supposed to explain.

The verse in the American Standard Version reads as follows: 'And I say unto you, make to yourselves friends by means of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when it shall fail, they may receive you into the eternal tabernacles.' Moffatt renders 'when you die' instead of 'when it shall fail,' reading the ἐκλείπητε of ℵ^{ca}ω Lat. Syr. Hl. instead of the ἐκλείπῃ of ℵ*AB*DLN. The difference is not material for the interpretation of the verse here put forward, though the Revisers' Text makes better sense, and has strong support from the great Uncials.

The difficulty of the verse, of course, is that Jesus, or a very early interpreter, is made to commend a course of action in which the end justifies the means. The contrast to other Synoptic teaching is so pointed that one is perplexed: 'Ye cannot serve God and mammon'; 'A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth'; 'Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth'; and so on. The text as it stands suggests a cynical worldly-wisdom foreign to the Gospels, and is in equally obvious contrast to the moral teaching of Israel's sages, that friends made because of one's wealth are as temporary and uncertain as affluence itself. For example, Pr 14^{20}, 'The poor is hated even of his own neighbour; but the rich hath many friends'; Pr 19^{7}, 'All the brethren of the poor do hate him: how much more do his friends go far from him?'

The explanation of the difficulty seems to lie in an unnoticed Semitism in Lk 16^{9}. This verse is part of the material peculiar to the Third Gospel, and, as Easton says in his commentary (*The Gospel according to St. Luke,* Introd. p. xxvii): 'L's style has a strong LXX colouring, and is marked by frequent Semitisms.' Certainly 'the mammon of unrighteousness' is as Hebraistic a phrase as one could expect to find, even in translation Greek. Why, then, has the preceding preposition also not been recognized as a Semitism? ἐκ is a curious word to express 'by means of'; we should expect ἐν, as in Ac 4^{9}, 'by what means (ἐν τίνι) this man is made whole.' ἐκ obviously corresponds to the Hebrew and Aramaic מִן. One of the common uses of מִן in the O.T. is in the privative sense, 'without, separated, free from' (Gesenius-Kautsch, 119: w), '*e.g.* Is 22^{3}, מִקֶּשֶׁת אֻסָּרוּ, 'without the bow they were made prisoners'; cf. Jer 48^{45}, מִכֹּחַ, 'without strength.' This מִן is sometimes rendered by ἐκ in the LXX, as in Nu 15^{24}, 'if it shall be done without the knowledge of the congregation,' ἐὰν ἐξ ὀφθαλμῶν τῆς συναγωγῆς γενηθῇ; Mic 3^{6}, 'Therefore it shall be night unto you, that ye shall have no vision' (Hebrew מֵחָזוֹן, Greek ἐξ ὁράσεως); and 'it shall be dark unto you, that ye shall not divine' (Hebrew מִקְּסֹם, Greek ἐκ μαντείας).

The writer suggests that Lk 16^{9} should be translated: 'Make to yourselves friends *without* (or, *apart from*) unrighteous mammon, that, when it fails you (as it is bound to do), they may receive you into the eternal abodes.' That is very similar in purport to: 'Lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth consume, and where thieves do not break through nor steal' (Mt 6^{20}). It is also a comprehensible comment on the story of the Steward, a 'son of this world,' who *did* make friends *by means of* his shrewdness in money matters, to suggest that for 'the sons of light' there is a more excellent way. The sentence will then begin, '*But* (not "and") I say unto you,' perhaps another Semitism, the use of *Waw* to introduce an antithetical rather than a co-ordinate clause.

R. B. Y. Scott.

Divinity Hall, Montreal,
Canada.

The Text of Romans vi. 13 in the Chester Beatty Papyrus.

In the Chester Beatty folio that contains the sixth chapter of Romans about half of each line is missing and has to be restored. This is how vv.$^{12.\ 13a}$ are restored in Sir Frederic Kenyon's superb edition of the Papyri:

> μη ουν βα
> σιλευετω η αμαρτι]α εν τω θνητω ϋμων
> σωματι εις το υ]πακουειν αυτη και πạ
> ριστανετε τα μελ]η ϋμων οπλα αδικιας
> τη αμαρτια αλλα π]αραστησατε εαυτους τ[ω
> θ̅ω̅

It will be noticed that, according to this restoration of the text, Paul tells his readers to present their members unto sin as weapons of unrighteousness, for it is not likely that the force of the μή at the beginning of v.^{12} persists as far as the word παριστάνετε in v.^{13}.

If this restoration is correct—as it very well may be—we must suppose that the scribe has mistakenly written καί for the μηδέ which is found (or implied) in all other authorities.

But it may be worth while to point out that a slightly different restoration is possible. It may well be that immediately after the καί the scribe wrote, not the imperative παριστάνετε, but the infinitive παριστάναι or παριστάνειν. This infinitive would be parallel with the preceding infinitive ὑπακούειν, and the text as thus restored would give good sense.

This suggested restoration would provide an entirely new reading in Ro 6^{13}; but that, of course, is no proof that the scribe of this manuscript did not write the infinitive.

It might be objected that ἀλλὰ παραστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς κτλ. should be preceded by the negative injunction μηδὲ παριστάνετε. But surely the positive injunction may be meant to balance the clause μὴ βασιλευέτω ἡ ἁμαρτία κτλ. at the beginning of v.^{12}. In that case the rendering would be: 'Let not sin reign in your mortal body that ye should obey it and present your members unto sin as weapons of unrighteousness. Rather present yourselves unto God.' Compare the force of ἀλλά in 3^{31}.

J. Hugh Michael.

Emmanuel College, Toronto.

John iv. 44.

A CORRESPONDENT last year in the November number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES offers an explanation of the difficulty of this passage by transposing the verses hereabouts. In *The Congregational Quarterly* last April I offered an alternative solution of the difficulty. The difficulty entirely disappears on the supposition that the paragraph 2^{1-12} has got displaced and that these verses should be inserted between 4^{43} and 4^{44}. Thus: 'Now after two days he departed thence, and went into Galilee. And the third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee. . . . After this he went down to Capernaum, he and his mother and his brethren and disciples; and they continued there not many days. For Jesus himself testified that a prophet hath no honour in his own country.' Hereupon follows the visit to Jerusalem for the passover. And, later on, when He returns to Galilee, we read that the Galileans received Him, having seen all things that He did at Jerusalem at the feast.

I explained, in the article referred to, that this solution depends upon a stichometrical analysis of the structure of the N.T. books. I believe it is demonstrable that the customary unit of Greek prose-writing up to the time of the N.T. (*i.e.* probably until the scroll-book gave way to the codex) was a column of 28 *στίχοι*, the *στίχος* being a line of thirty-six letters, the prose equivalent of the hexameter.

The application of this stichometrical test solves countless textual difficulties both in the N.T. and elsewhere. These early chapters of John, like so much more of the N.T., are badly dislocated, and the present sequences are not those of the original book. By the stichometrical test the original sequences can be recovered, and the N.T. writings restored to complete lucidity and coherence.

The above is but one illustration out of a whole multitude that might be produced.

LEWIS JOHNSON.

Bristol.

A Note on Genesis xxvi. 7–11.

GN 12^{10-20} (J), 20 (E), and 26^{7-11} (J) are generally regarded as variants; and the fact that two occur in J is one of the main reasons for the theory of two strata in J's Abraham narratives. There seem, however, to be good grounds for regarding 26^{7-10} (without $v.^{11}$) as an interpolation dependent on 12^{10-20} and 20: (1) The youthful beauty of Rebekah in 26^{7-10} is already long past in 25^{27-34} (J). (2) The story seems to interrupt the sequence of 26 (cf. Skinner, *Genesis*, 365: 'It is . . . natural to consider $vv.^{12ff.}$ the continuation of $v.^{6}$; indeed, it might fairly be questioned whether $vv.^{7-11}$ is not a later insertion, interrupting the continuity of the main narrative'—an observation which applies with the same force if $v.^{11}$ is connected with $v.^{6}$ instead of $vv.^{7-10}$. (3) In Jubilees $24^{12f.}$ the story is omitted and, with the usual slight alterations, $v.^{11}$ follows on to $v.^{6}$: 'And he dwelt in Gerar three weeks of years. And Abimelech charged concerning him and concerning all that was his, saying . . .' (4) It can hardly be a coincidence that the two phrases which 12^{10-20} and 20 have in common both recur in 26^{7-10} ('She is my sister' 12^{19} $20^{2.5}$ $26^{7.9}$; 'What is this that thou hast done unto me?' 12^{18}, or 'What hast thou done unto us?' 20^{9}, combined in 26^{10} as 'What is this thou hast done unto us?'). It is not likely that all three versions should independently choose to reproduce the same two phrases of the original tradition; the most probable explanation, in view of the forms taken by the second phrase, is that 26^{7-10} is dependent upon both 12^{10-20} and 20. (5) It is difficult not to agree with Gunkel's opinion that this is the latest and most colourless of the three versions. Since J is generally considered to be more primitive than E almost throughout, there is a strong presumption that 26^{7-10} is an addition to J coming from a later date than E.

It is worthy of notice also that outside $vv.^{7-10}$ this chapter not only does not contradict 12^{10-20}, but directly refers to it (26^{1}); and that the play on the name Isaac in $v.^{8}$ differs from that of either stratum of J (18^{12-15} 21^{6b}). It seems probable that $v.^{11}$ originally followed on to $v.^{6}$ and had no reference to any actual molestation of Rebekah; a later redactor, however, inferred, with a misguided subtlety common among early Jewish interpreters, that an incident similar to those of 12^{10-20} and 20 had befallen Rebekah also. He therefore inserted $v.^{7-10}$, repeating the story with only one alteration; it was clear from $v.^{11}$ that the danger to Rebekah came not from Abimelech, but from the people, and the story was therefore adjusted accordingly.

A. C. GRAHAM.

Penarth, Glamorgan.

Matthew xi. 25–27: Luke x. 21–22.

THIS logion of Jesus has always constituted a problem. No help in its interpretation is to be gained from its context, as it appears in different contexts in Matthew and in Luke. It is agreed that it came from 'Q,' but the difficulty has been to fit it into the Synoptic picture of Jesus, and to reconcile it with the Synoptic record of His teaching.

The saying has been taken generally in one of two ways: (1) It has been accepted as a genuine saying of Jesus, and regarded as evidence of His Messianic or Divine consciousness. It is admitted that evidence in such set terms is unique in the Synoptic Gospels, and parallels from the Fourth Gospel are consequently adduced. Streeter remarks that the Fourth Gospel twice says that 'The Father had given all things into his (Jesus') hands.'

(2) Others have treated the saying as an echo of the thought of the Early Church about the Person of Christ. The words are considered as impossible as an actual utterance of the Jesus who speaks in the Sermon on the Mount. The saying represents Jesus as 'similar to a Hellenistic Redeemer god calling men to himself' (Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*). 'In the churches in which the passage arose, the person of Jesus was looked upon in the light of this redemption faith.' Texts which are partial parallels from Hellenistic writings are adduced.

The suggestion here put forward is that these verses are not to be taken as evidence of Jesus' claim to be a supernatural being, as in the Fourth Gospel, nor as evidence of the Christology of the Early Church, but as witness to the prophetic consciousness of Jesus. In the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus is spoken of not only as a teacher or Rabbi, but as a prophet (Lk 7^{16}, Mt 21^{11}). He accepted the designation for Himself (Lk 4^{24} 13^{33}).

Two things are characteristic of the Old Testament prophets—a consciousness of being called, and a claim to speak as the voice of Yahweh. 'Thus saith the Lord' is the note of the prophetic utterance. Consequently the prophet, although he often avoids autobiography, necessarily has to speak about himself. (See, *e.g.*, Am 7^{15}, Is $6^{9.\,10}$, Jer $1^{5.\,7.\,10}$, Ezk 2^{3}, Is $61^{1.\,8}$). Now if we could overhear the prophet's prayers, we should hear something like this: 'Thou doest nothing but revealest thy secret to thy servant (cf. Am 3^{7}), thou didst reveal thyself in mine ear (cf. Is 22^{14}), thou hast anointed me to preach . . .' (cf. Is 61^{1}). And if the prophet were to announce his commission and revelation to others he would declare: 'The Lord knew me before I was born, and sanctified me and appointed me (cf. Jer 1^{5}), and sent me to the children of Israel, to be his mouthpiece' (cf. Ezk $2^{3.\,4}$). This sounds like self-exaltation. But it is not arrogance, but a part of the prophet's message.

In the Synoptic passage under consideration we have sayings of Jesus in both these forms of utterance—a prayer, thanksgiving for the revelation; and then a declaration of the source of the revelation. Admitting that the prophetic consciousness of Jesus goes far beyond that of the Old Testament prophets, we can yet see that there is nothing here which could not be uttered by the greatest of the prophets, in a moment of exultation, especially if we accept Harnack's version of the original 'Q' text: 'No one knew the Father save the Son, and he to whom the Son is willing to reveal him.'

This mode of treatment throws light also on the invitation, 'Come unto me . . .,' which follows in Matthew's version. The prophet, speaking as the mouthpiece of God, sometimes omits the introductory 'Thus saith the Lord' (as in Is 61^{8}), and speaks his revelation in the first person. This is what Jesus does here: 'This is my revelation of the Father, who says, Come unto me . . .' Here also Jesus is speaking, not like the Johannine Christ, nor like a Greek mystery-religion deity, but like an Old Testament prophet.

HAROLD A. GUY.

Gosport, Hants.

* * *

'Healing' in the Book of Proverbs.

If a spiritual healer with some knowledge of Hebrew were to work through the Old Testament in the original, he or she would probably find many passages in which the text has been misunderstood. This occurred to me on re-reading the Book of Proverbs in Hebrew. In nine passages I observed a noun derived from the verb 'to heal' occurs, and, although its form implies an active sense 'healing,' it is translated in such a way as to indicate a less active potency like 'remedy,' or a passive state like 'health.' Let me quote first the translations of the Revised Version and then give my own renderings.

In Pr 3^{8} we read: 'It shall be health to thy navel, and marrow to thy bones.' A better translation would be: 'It shall be a healing to thy navel, and refreshment to thy bones.' In Pr 4^{22} we read: 'For they are life unto those that find them, and health to all their flesh.' A better translation would be: 'For they are life unto those that find them, and a healing to their whole body.' The words of divine wisdom imparted by a father give life and bring healing. In Pr 6[15] we read: 'Therefore shall his calamity come suddenly; on a sudden shall he be broken, and that without remedy.' A better translation would be: 'Therefore shall his calamity come suddenly; suddenly shall he be broken, and there shall be no healing.' Disaster may overtake a worthless and iniquitous man so suddenly that there is no opportunity for healing.

In Pr 12[18] we read: 'There is that speaketh rashly like the piercings of a sword : but the tongue of the wise is health.' A better translation would be: 'There are those who speak rash words (which cut) like the piercings of a sword, but the tongue of a wise man brings healing.' A wise man or woman speaks healing words of divine wisdom. Pr 13[17] reads: 'A wicked messenger falleth into evil; but a faithful ambassador is health.' A better translation would be: 'A wicked envoy falls into evil; but a faithful ambassador brings healing.' The word translated 'envoy' often means 'angel.' The passage, therefore, perhaps amounts to saying: 'A bad angel falls into evil; but a good angel brings healing.' In Pr 14[30] we read: 'A sound heart is the life of the flesh: but envy is the rottenness of the bones.' A better translation would be: 'A healing mind gives life to the body: but jealousy corrodes the bones.' 'Heart' in Hebrew commonly means 'mind.' In Pr 15[4] we read: 'A wholesome tongue is a tree of life; but perverseness therein is a breaking of the spirit.' A better translation would be: 'A healing tongue is a tree of life; but perverseness therein is destructive of the breath (*i.e.* of the breath of life).' In Pr 16[24] we read: 'Pleasant words are *as* an honey-comb, sweet to the soul, and health to the bones.' A better translation would be: 'Pleasant words are a honey-comb, sweet to the soul, and healing to the body.' 'Bone' in Hebrew often means 'body.'

Lastly, in Pr 29[1] we read: 'He that being often reproved hardeneth his neck shall suddenly be broken, and that without remedy.' A better translation would be: 'A man of reproofs who stiffens his neck shall be broken suddenly, and there shall be no healing.' In other words, a man who is always reproving others, or a man who is continually subject to reproof, and who obstinately refuses to amend his ways, may suddenly be overtaken by calamity without hope of healing.

Thus, the translators, not understanding the use of the word 'healing' in these passages, seem to have gone out of their way to find meaningless substitutes. MAURICE A. CANNEY.

London.

Entre Nous.

Church of England Doctrine.

As we go to press, the Report of the Commission, appointed in 1922, is published. In his Introduction the Archbishop of York, the Chairman, says: 'The Commission was appointed because the tensions between different schools of thought in the Church of England were imperilling its unity and impairing its effectiveness.' In a number of cases the Report expresses the view that varieties of doctrine should be tolerated. In his Introduction, Dr. Temple emphasizes the distinction 'between the judgment that such-and-such an opinion is incompatible with the Christian faith or the Anglican tradition, and the judgment that such-and-such a person, who holds an opinion thus condemned, should be excluded from the exercise of office or of membership in the Church.'

The Virgin Birth.

'Many of us hold that belief in the Word made flesh is integrally bound up with belief in the Virgin Birth, and that this will increasingly be recognized. There are, however, some among us who hold that a full belief in the historical Incarnation is more consistent with the supposition that our Lord's birth took place under the normal conditions of human generation.'

In his Introduction Dr. Temple says: 'I think it right here to affirm that I wholeheartedly accept as historical facts the Birth of our Lord from a Virgin Mother, and the Resurrection of His physical body from death and the tomb. And I anticipate, though with less assurance, that these events will appear to be intrinsically bound up with His Deity when the relations between the spiritual and physical elements in our nature are more completely understood.'

The Bible.

Its inspiration is inferred from the character of its contents, all of which do not stand on the same spiritual level. The Bible is the chief source of guidance for spiritual life.

Dr. Temple says:

'We fully acknowledge the supremacy of Scripture as supplying the standard of doctrine; and we try to indicate how Scripture should be regarded in this connexion: every one knows that it is possible to quote texts which, torn from their context, may be presented as supporting entirely unchristian opinions. Short of that, every one knows that most heretics have been convinced that they were conscientiously following and interpreting Scripture. Our attention must be fastened on the trend of Scripture as a whole and upon its climax in the record of the Word made flesh, by the light of which all the rest is to be interpreted; in that concentration of attention and in that interpretation our best guide is the continuous stream of universal Christian tradition.'

What is a Good Sermon?

Principal Wheeler Robinson answers the question in *The Baptist Quarterly* (January 1938). A good sermon, he says, is that which utters 'the personal conviction of a great truth, intelligibly expressed and applied, and imparted with the dignity of a Word of God.' Four points then are made:

(1) Vital religion needs the vitamin of conviction, and most of all does the vital religion of one who would be an ambassador of Christ. Emerson, in a 'Lecture to Divinity Students,' recalls how he once entered a church whilst the snow was falling. 'The snow-storm was real: the preacher merely spectral, and the eye felt the sad contrast in looking at him, and then out of the window behind him into the beautiful meteor of the snow. He had lived in vain. He had no one word intimating that he had laughed or wept, was married or in love, had been commended, or cheated, or chagrined. If he had ever lived or acted, we were none the wiser for it. The capital secret of his profession—namely, to convert life into truth—he had not learned.'

(2) Good preaching must deal with great truths, and not with mere trivialities. This generation thirsts for something better than it is getting.

As Mr. J. B. Priestley writes in *They Walk in the City*: 'They are no longer children of God and are not yet contented and unwondering big bees and ants . . . they still feel that there are mysteries, vast unfathomable gulfs in which birth, love, death are created out of darkness and inexplicable light, but now they are out of touch with any possible explanation of these mysteries, any explorations of these gulfs; the old accounts of these things they instinctively reject, the new have not arrived; and no sooner does anything of real importance happen, something that a dynamo or an internal combustion engine cannot work, than they are back in the wilderness with only the bleached bones of prophets to comfort them.'

(3) The third feature of a good sermon is intelligible expression. Stopford Brooke, writing to one of his children with literary ambitions, said: 'What you children need to learn is that when you have an idea you must shape it, shape it, SHAPE IT.' When we listen to a wireless talk by Sir James Jeans on astronomy, or by Sir William Bragg on physics, we may easily forget that the apparent simplicity is a work of great art, partly in the selection of illustration, partly in the choice of language. How the great masters have toiled over their language to get the exact expression of what they would give to others!

(4) The sermon belongs to that unity we call worship, and must have the fitness and dignity which characterize true worship. Neither preachers nor hearers always sufficiently remember what worship really is. It is 'worth-ship,' the humble and grateful recognition of God's worth. It depends, therefore, on what we give rather than on what we get. If the thoughts of the congregation, as it individually bows the head on entering a church, could be flashed on a great screen, we should have a test of the worship-value of that congregation. All the elements of the religious service ought to be subdued to the one central fact—that something is being offered to God.

Bantu Vignettes.

In *Children of the Veld* (James Clarke; 6s. net), Mr. Robert H. W. Shepherd, M.A., of Lovedale, says little about himself, but the reader is drawn to Mr. Shepherd, cannot help liking him. 'Over thirty years before, after a long and arduous school and university career that left him with the tastes of a scholar, he had found himself dumped on a rocky hill to start his life-work, living in uncouth and primitive quarters the life of a bachelor missionary among heathen hordes. It had all been his own choice and he never, even in the first raw days, looked back, but there were times when the contrast between what had been and what was now lit up his face with a rueful smile, and he would sigh for just a little of the comfort he had known.'

Children of the Veld consists of a number of short studies of Bantu life and customs—vignettes, Mr. Shepherd calls them, and very charming they are. Mr. Shepherd has the gift of making simple things interesting, and there is humour and pathos in plenty in the sketches. There is, for example, the story of Johnson, a Bantu teacher, who gained at Blythswood Institution a fine reputation for scholarship. He lived in the home village with his illiterate father and mother, and was in charge of the school there. One day Mr. Shepherd had a letter thrust into his hand. The handwriting was Johnson's. 'I give it just as it was written, for of translation there is no need :

'" REVEREND AND DEAR SIR,—I report that I did not attend school three days owing to sickness that fell at my home. Nobody is sick now. I do not know then whether I should stay away from school, but I am well.

'" This sickness has been the cause of my utmost misery, for it took both my parents.—Your obedient servant, JOHNSON TINISE."

'" This sickness has been the cause of my utmost misery, for it took both my parents." In the hour of its extremity, the heart, the world over, utters the self-same cry.'

In the chapter on Modern Contacts there is a paragraph on church divisions. It would be difficult to find one that would put this mission difficulty more forcibly.

'The telephone bell rings. It is a call from the local mission hospital. " There is a patient here," the matron is heard saying, " whose religious denomination we cannot fathom. All that we can get from her is that she belongs to ' Ama-Twenty-four ' " (the Twenty-four).

'" That is easy," I reply. " She is a member of the Free Church of Scotland—the ' Wee Frees ' as they are commonly called—whose original membership was some twenty-four ministers and elders who objected to church union in Scotland in the year 1900."

'I lay down the receiver, thinking of the folly that has brought the melancholy divisions of European Christendom into Africa, and stamped them on the minds of one of the most imitative races on earth. It is calculated that in the Union of South Africa there are now some three hundred different Bantu denominations. Numbers of them bear the most fantastic designations, such as " The Church of God on the Slopes of Mount Zion." '

The Same Sermon.

'" The people at the out-stations are complaining," he [an old Bantu Evangelist] announced as the two crossed the veld early one Sunday morning.

'" What is the matter ? "

'" They say you don't give them the same food as you give to those at the main station."

'And so it came to the novice that what would be deemed a shortcoming in another country was in Tembuland a sign of grace—in sermons he must treat the same theme all round.'

Self-Deification.

Reinhold Niebuhr in *The Christian Century* says :

'It must be admitted, of course, that our Protestant inheritance disintegrates into secularism much more easily than Catholicism does. It must also be admitted that many of our Protestant radical minorities allow themselves to be used as cats-paws and allies of anti-religious radicals without any sense of responsibility toward their religious inheritance and with no sure hold upon the truth which divides them from secularists. They stand against Roman Catholicism but are in danger of becoming enmeshed in Stalin's catholicism. For Stalin is but a secularized version of the Pope. . . . The danger that radical Protestantism may become a too servile ally of secular radicals can be avoided only if our criticism of the Catholic heresy is made, not from the standpoint of secular cynics but from the standpoint of Protestant Christian faith. We will resist all temporal divinities, whether they call themselves popes, kings by divine right or commissars. We will not be under the illusion that we can get rid of this tendency toward self-deification by getting rid of the Catholic faith or the Christian religion. We recognize in it the very quintessence of sin, the tendency of man to make himself God. That we should discover the Christian Church itself as a potential vehicle of this sin will make us the more circumspect in our claims and the more certain that the majesty of God may reveal itself in the destruction of historic Christian Churches as well as in their preservation.'

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,
and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings
Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

TIME and eternity in their nature and in their relation to one another present to the philosopher and to the theologian their deepest metaphysical problem. We speak of time flowing on. What does it flow through, or past? We can detect the smooth flow of a river by watching the banks. Must there not similarly be something, which is not time, by contrast to which we detect the flight of time?

Is the temporal or the eternal the more real? Some have assigned to the eternal the whole of reality. Time and all things that are in time amount to no more than a dream which has somehow flitted across the eternally real as a shadow flits across the face of the waters. Contrariwise philosophers of an opposite tendency have made time and its categories the supreme and only real, and have dismissed the eternal as unknown and unknowable.

It need hardly be said that this latter tendency is dominant in the science and in the general mind of our day. Even our religious thinkers appear to be unable to conceive of the eternal except as an indefinite prolongation of time. The world to come is envisaged as simply a continuation of the evolutionary process which is believed to be going on in the present world. The doctrine of eternal punishment is abandoned as unthinkable because it is conceived as simply an unending process of conscious suffering. It does not seem to be realized that eternity is in some incomprehensible sense the negation of time, a state in which time shall be no more. If, as St. Augustine said, God created the world not *in* time, but *with* time, then time belongs to this present world only, and whatever survives or goes beyond that must, whether for weal or woe, bear upon it the stamp of the eternal.

In recent years this most baffling subject has repeatedly engaged the attention of religious and philosophical writers. One might mention among others the Bampton Lectures of 1936, and now we have the Forwood Lectures delivered by the late Professor J. L. STOCKS. The title is *Time, Cause, and Eternity* (Macmillan; 6s. net).

In this very able and closely reasoned treatise the writer confines himself to one branch of his great subject, namely, cause, in its relation to time and eternity. His contention is that the cause of things is not to be found simply in their temporal antecedents but must be sought for in an eternal realm.

Plato, as is well known, found the reality and formal cause of things in eternal forms of which all that is temporal is the moving shadow. He makes Socrates in the *Phaedo* declare his belief that, in some way which he cannot understand, it is eternal beauty that makes all beautiful things beautiful. Pursuing the same line, Aristotle developed the notion of cause as fourfold. There is the material of which the world is made, together with some dominant eternal form or essence which gives to it its character. Third, there is that which gives it motion, as we should say, the efficient cause. And, lastly, there is a principle directed to order and goodness, what we call the final cause, a divine purpose running through the whole.

Now it must be obvious to any one acquainted with modern thought that some of Aristotle's four causes have been practically ruled out. In modern science things are thought to be fully explained by their components and physical antecedents. 'Matter is no longer the destined recipient of appropriate form, and the source of movement is no longer the embodied form actuating the process which leads to a further embodiment of the same form. Both matter and motion acquire autonomy. Matter becomes equivalent to Body, and Motion is now an ultimate fact.' In a word, the scientist has become frankly materialistic, and when he philosophizes he finds no room for the operation of eternal and final causes, that is, for God and a divine purpose in the world.

At the same time, there is evidence of a growing doubt among scientists themselves as to the sufficiency of their own materialistic explanation. Physicists are brought to a halt before the mystery of the atom, and are more ready to concede the possible presence and action of some spiritual force. Science, as Planck the doyen of German scientists admits, must now surrender its fundamental assumption that 'the course of a process can be explained by means of an analysis of it into its spacial and temporal elements.' Under a similar constraint, biologists have begun to speak about 'emergence' and '*creative* evolution,' indicating thereby that the whole is in some way greater than the sum of its parts, that there is a power behind the evolutionary process which causes new forms to appear.

This side of things is emphasized in the science of history, which must ever be opposed to the materialism of physical science. In history the dominant thing is not matter but form, that is some influence of a spiritual kind operating on and shaping matter. History 'must necessarily involve making will and reason the universal directing forces of the world,' and the idea of progress 'involves an exaltation of man in the scheme of things which is quite foreign to the scientific point of view.' 'The *vera causa* for the historian is always in the end form, not matter—a powerful and outstanding personality, the pervasive character of an age or of a people, each regarded as drawing from the environment material or opportunity, rather than as resultants deducible by otherwise assured scientific principles from the ascertained nature of that environment.'

The question rises, Can the scientific and the historical view be reconciled? Any philosophy or world view that claims to be comprehensive must take account of both, and the Greek synthesis must be held to be more complete than any which the modern world offers. The modern world is trying to work with too narrow a conception of cause, and we need for a solution the reintroduction of something like the Aristotelian conception of a timeless formal cause. There must be a full and frank recognition of the material cause. All the physical elements in any situation can be entirely accounted for from this point of view. But 'just as a fixed alphabet and vocabulary do not prevent poets from continually enriching civilization with novelties in poetry, so with Nature, we may suppose, the element of sameness does not obstruct the continual appearance of difference.' Mere dead repetition would deprive the passage of time of all meaning. The ceaseless repetition which is characteristic of Nature 'for the first time acquires sense and significance when it is seen as the vehicle of life.' 'The recognition of the historical point of view has given life and mind an independent position and significance.'

Yet such a picture as this still fails to give complete satisfaction. Our minds instinctively seek for some means of grasping the universe as a whole, and of finding significance and value in it. This is fundamentally a demand for organic unity. The human mind 'is not satisfied that events on the world stage shall be shown as running on endlessly, haphazard, a series of loose episodes; it will have its beginning, the creation of the world; its end, the day of judgment, so that what falls between may be significant. It will have also its Great Artificer, the omnipotent God, who is eternally the same.'

This supra-temporal view has great practical value for ethical life. 'A man can no more find his way through the complicated problems of personal and social life if he has no eyes but for them, than he can find his way across the sea if he keeps his eyes on the ship and on the waves. In navigation the stars provide the fixed point of reference which he needs, and for practical affairs similarly an external reference is the indispensable condition of security.' This principle could be formulated and defended on purely ethical grounds, but 'it has been the special service of religion to the practical life of man that it has consistently exerted itself to keep this principal alive, giving it at the same time new warmth and colour from the rich resources of religious enthusiasm.'

Dr. Francis UNDERHILL, Bishop of Bath and Wells, has published a popular monograph on *Saint Peter* (Centenary Press; 7s. 6d. net). He has succeeded very well in overcoming the difficulty presented by the fact that the New Testament material is so slight and the legendary material so vast. What he has done is this. He has expounded the New Testament material carefully and elaborately, and the legendary material he has treated compendiously.

Bishop UNDERHILL's standpoint in theology is essentially conservative. In his references, for example, to the miracles of Christ he notes that the wheel has now so fully turned that miracles, instead of affording any support to the truth of the revelation of God in Christ, are regarded by many apologists as positive embarrassments. But he goes on to point out that many of the miracles of Christ are to-day regarded as more likely than they were twenty-five years ago; and he adds that as we come to understand better the movements of spiritual knowledge as well as scientific discovery serious thought will turn still further towards positive belief in 'some, at least,' of the signs which followed the ministry of our Lord.

His treatment of the incident of Christ's walking on the sea is in line with the standpoint above adumbrated. He is careful to mention that some scholars regard the story as a Christian Midrash rather than the record of an actual incident. On the other hand, he says that the phenomenon of 'levitation' occurs so abundantly in the histories of the Saints that it is difficult to doubt the fact of its occurrence; and that what can apparently be done by a Hindu or by an English medium is also possible for Jesus Christ and for Peter. Moreover, if what Christians believe about Jesus Christ is true, we should not expect His actions, any more than His teaching, to remain on the level of common experience.

But can an essential conservatism afford to be so accommodating as our author seems to be in the words that follow: 'Whether we regard the walking on the water as a pious tale with little or no historical foundation, or whether we believe it as a solid fact, the teaching involved is unaffected by the critical position we take up or by our acceptance of the incident as literally true. At the lowest we have here a parable pregnant with meaning; at the highest a searching test of the faith of Peter and his fellows.' On such principles it would not matter if all the miracles of Christ were resolved into parables; and yet, apparently, our author would not be content that this should be.

One is naturally interested in an expositor's treatment of Christ's words, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church.' From this sentence the Roman Catholic Church deduces in part her claim to be the only Christian and Catholic Church, all other Christian bodies being in heresy and schism and therefore excommunicate.

Bishop UNDERHILL admits that the passage, if genuine, strongly supports the position of Peter as

Prince of the Apostles, though he would not allow the claim. But he does not enter afresh into the controversy. He reviews, however, the arguments for and against the position that the words reported to have been spoken by Christ to Peter are a 'gloss,' added in the interests of the Roman claim. Let us set out these arguments in brief.

For the interpretation of the words as a 'gloss.' (1) St. Matthew alone of the three first Evangelists has recorded the words, though they occur in a passage taken over from St. Mark. (2) The identification of the Kingdom with the visible Church presupposes a later, though still early, period in the history of the Church. (3) If Peter was declared to be the rock on which the Church is to be founded, why the later argument as to which of the disciples is the greatest?

Against the interpretation of the words as a 'gloss.' (1) The passage, if an addition, is only a little later than the original text. (2) Peter's outspoken witness to the truth would naturally meet with a strong commendation. (3) St. Matthew writing for Jews would be the more likely to recall such words; the other Synoptists wrote for Gentiles. (4) The language used in the whole passage (Peter addressed as 'Simon,' human nature described as 'flesh and blood') is characteristic of Christ. (5) The history of the Early Church confirms the words attributed to Christ, as Peter stands head and shoulders above the other disciples.

Our author adds, as against the Roman Catholic view, that nowhere in the New Testament, except in this passage, is any special office created for Peter. He remains one of the Apostles, as such occupying a unique position, having like the other Apostles no successor.

Perhaps the most striking part of Mr. BEZZANT's book on *Aspects of Belief* (reviewed elsewhere) is the opening section which deals with the Christian doctrine of man. After, in his opening chapter, discussing the nature of personality, he goes on to explore the fundamental experiences of sin, forgiveness, and grace. These have been interpreted in the past in the light of a traditional anthropology, based upon the early narrative of the Fall in the Book of Genesis, accepted as revealed truth. We now know, however, that that story dates from a time subsequent to the exalted monotheism and lofty moral teaching of the great prophets of Israel.

At first, and for long centuries afterwards, the story was not regarded as an explanation of realized sinfulness and of a consequent alienation from God; it was rather an explanation of the physical struggles of life, its trials and hardships, of the fact that life is not lived in a Paradise of pleasantness and peace. We know the story to be myth—an attempt to account for facts when the knowledge requisite for explanation was scanty. It is strange, but nevertheless a fact, that the famous story in Gn 3 influenced neither the theology nor the anthropology of the Old Testament, which contains no reference to it. The Old Testament was concerned with the fact of sin, which was not considered mysterious, rather than with any theories of the origin of sin.

The main lines of the historical Christian conception of man were laid by St. Paul and fixed by St. Augustine. The real origin of what they wrote was in their own experience, in their own inward conflicts. St. Paul accepted the Genesis story of Adam's sin as fact; and it came to be accepted not only as fact, but as the explanation of the inward moral struggle and of the strength of the passions, with which originally the story was not concerned. But the great passages in the Epistle to the Romans which deal with this question had very little influence in the Early Church. It was not until the text of Romans was made the basis of systematic comment and exposition that the significance of the passages dealing with human sin was realized.

Even now it is difficult to understand St. Paul's doctrine of human nature and of sin except as it comes to us through the mind of St. Augustine. It is true that the great African theologian's extreme views of the total depravity of human nature owing to the transmission of the supposedly corrupted seed of Adam, and the shocking implications which he drew from 'this horrible doctrine' have never been fully or officially accepted by the Catholic Church as a whole. This unenviable distinction belongs to certain Protestant sects, and it has been often characteristic of evangelical theology. This fact, however, does not neutralize the historical effects of the belief.

Thus the ceaseless inward struggle between the ideal on the one hand and instinct and appetite on the other came to be regarded as contrary to the divine intention—the result of sin and itself sinful. Man, it was supposed, by reason of organic descent from Adam, could justly be held responsible for his instincts and passional appetites; merely to possess them, apart from what man did about them, was sin. It is clear, however, that Gn 3 itself contains no idea of original sin, and, as a matter of history, was not the source of that idea or of the doctrine of the Fall. The historical fact is that these doctrines only arose in late Judaism as the result of reflection on realized sinfulness. It was then, and not before, that the Eden story was appealed to as confirming and explaining what experience suggested.

Moreover, it is now recognized that no place for a Fall or for anything resembling it can be found within the known history of man. But that is not enough. The consequent and necessary adjustments should be made if a right estimate of sin and a true doctrine of man are to be attained. We inherit tendencies and appetites from a remote and subhuman ancestry. This state of affairs theology has called 'concupiscence' and often wrongly regarded as 'original sin.' But it requires no hypothesis of a fall from innocence to explain it, nor can we be regarded as responsible for it. The solidarity of the human race is a truth, but it must not be so interpreted as to mean that the individual is accountable for what happened before his earthly life began.

It is one of the commonest charges against a form of Christianity which frankly accepts modern knowledge about man that its conception of sin is superficial and deficient. But the evolutionary view of the world, and its consequences, afford no grounds for any superficiality about sin. Pelagianism, or any other easy-going optimism about human nature and human sin, gets little support from modern knowledge. Evolution is a progress upwards, and sin is the rejection of that better and higher through which alone progress is achieved. And the consciousness of accountability for the rejection of the higher is a fact of psychology which cannot be reduced to any other category. Only a bottomless scepticism can pronounce it an illusion. The reason is that 'what ought to be' is never something we manufacture; it is always, as it were, *given*, waiting to be recognized and attained. The higher environment is always in front of our response to it.

It is this experience of failure that is the real and sufficient basis of man's need of forgiveness and of the grace of God. The doctrine of forgiveness is often said to be unethical on the ground that sin cannot be done away with. But the essential thing to remember about this doctrine is that it does not profess to wipe out the consequences of sin except by removing its causes. Its purpose is to enable men to accept those consequences in a new light and in a new spirit, and in so doing to rise above sins and consequences alike. It is only when we are unforgiven that we concern ourselves with escaping sin's consequences. Forgiveness itself does the work of punishment.

It is forgiveness alone which makes true progress possible and thus assists the growth of man's nature towards its highest possibilities. To be awakened to what is really demanded of us is to recognize that we cannot rise to it. Worse, past failures, sins and their consequences, have made us less able to rise to what we ought to be. It is this deep need that forgiveness and grace alone can meet. They meet it, not by pretending that our condition is other than it is, or by any easy condoning of it. They confer an insight, true insight, as to our real place, in a world that is God's, and in His family. Forgiveness transforms the world in which, with damaged sight, we have been living in sin, into the true world in which there is fellowship with God, and in which all things consistent with righteousness and love are possible.

The Reformation and the English Bible.

By the Reverend J. H. Morrison, D.D., Aberdeen.

This year of grace 1938 has been chosen as the four hundredth anniversary of the beginning of the Reformation in England. The Reformation was an era rather than a single event, so that it would be hard to say what moment or what year, marks its beginning. But the year 1538 has been chosen very fitly, because in that year King Henry VIII. authorized the publication of the Bible in the English tongue, and gave injunction to all the clergy to place a copy in every parish church. 'Ye shall provyde one boke of the whole Bible of the largest volume in Englishe, and the same sett up in summe convenyent place within the said churche that ye have care of, whereas your parishioners may most commodiouslye resort to the same and rede yt.' Moreover, they were bidden 'expresslye provoke, stere, and exhort every parsone (person) to rede the same, as the whyche ys the verye lively worde of God.' From this time onward there might be seen in the vestibule or aisle of any church in England an eager group of common people listening to the reading of the Word of God in their own tongue wherein they were born.

We still speak of our English Bible as 'the Authorized Version,' because authorized by King James in 1611, but probably we never stop to think how great a triumph for the Word of God it was when it was thus authorized and given to the people. For in former times the Bible had been 'banned and barred, forbidden fare.' The Emperor Diocletian, the last and most bitter of the pagan persecutors, had issued an edict that all Christian assemblies should be forbidden, all churches pulled down, and all copies of the Bible burned. It was an astute policy, for as the historian Neander says: 'The plan of destroying every existing copy of the scriptures, could it have been carried out, would have cut off the very source from which true Christianity and the very life of the Church was continually springing with fresh and invincible energy. . . . The transmission of Christianity was not in itself, it is true, inseparably and necessarily connected with the letter of the scriptures. But exposed to the manifold sources of corruption which exist in human nature, Christianity, without the well-spring of Scripture to recur to and recover its purity, would, as all history teaches, have been quickly overwhelmed under a load of falsehoods and corruptions.' This, as we know, was what happened in Western Europe during the long, dark ages when Rome was supreme and kept the Scriptures locked up in the Latin tongue.

Hence this authorizing of the Bible in the speech of the common people may fitly be regarded as the most signal event of the Reformation, its purest and most permanent gift. Erasmus, the greatest scholar of the Reformation period, in the preface to his edition of the New Testament, had said: 'I wish the Scriptures to be translated into all languages so that they may be read and understood not only by Scots and Irishmen but also by Turks and Saracens. I long that the husbandman should sing portions of them to himself as he follows the plough, that the weaver should hum them to the tune of his shuttle, that the traveller should beguile with these stories the tedium of his journey.' This noble dream was now to be brought within the realm of actual fact. It was therefore a great day for the people of England when the Bible, which had heretofore been burned and banned by the confederate authority of Church and State, was now authorized to be printed and published and read. It was a second and greater Magna Charta. It supplied them with a criterion to judge, and a power to overthrow all tyrannies. It flung open to all seekers the gates of truth and life, and should be held in grateful remembrance for ever.

1. Consider how completely the Bible has made its home amongst us. It is a Jewish book, but we never think of it as such. Its imagery is Eastern, but it has made its home in the West. It comes from very ancient times, yet it is not felt to be antique. The Psalms of David are as familiar as our own folk-songs. We express our religious joy in Hebrew Hallelujahs, and end our prayers with the Hebrew Amen. A comparatively obscure town upon the bare uplands of Judah has come to represent to us the city of God and the eternal home of the soul.

The English Bible has entwined itself in the most intricate way into the whole of our literature. Its narratives are used for illustration, its proverbs and similes are household words, its truths have sunk into the national mind and have inspired much that is noblest in our poetry, philosophy, and oratory. Without a knowledge of the English

Bible many of our best books would be but partly intelligible, so greatly has our literature been enriched and beautified by Biblical allusions. A long and imposing list might be given of the testimonies of our leading thinkers and masters in literature witnessing to the supreme influence of the English Bible. Take this remarkable utterance of Huxley, who in his day was regarded as a formidable opponent of the Christian faith: 'Consider the great historical fact that for three centuries this book has been woven into the life of all that is best and noblest in English history; that it has become the national epic of Britain, and is as familiar to noble and simple, from John o' Groat's House to Land's End, as Dante and Tasso once were to the Italians; that it is written in the noblest and purest English, and abounds in exquisite beauties of mere literary form; and, finally, that it forbids the veriest hind who never left his village to be ignorant of the existence of other countries and other civilizations, and of a great past, stretching back to the farthest limits of the oldest nations of the world. By the study of what other book could children be so much humanized and made to feel that each figure in that vast historical procession fills, like ourselves, but a momentary space in the interval between two eternities, and earns the blessings or the curses of all time, according to its effort to do good and hate evil.'

From a very different source one might quote a witness to the fact that the English Bible is not only entwined in all the finest literature of our country but is enshrined in the heart of the common people. Faber, after he had gone over to the Church of Rome, looked back towards it with wistful eyes, and wrote of it: 'Who will say that the uncommon beauty and marvellous English of the Protestant Bible is not one of the great strongholds of heresy in this country? It lives on the ear like a music that can never be forgotten, like the sound of church bells, which the convert scarcely knows how to forego. It is part of the national mind, and the anchor of the national seriousness. The memory of the dead passes into it. The potent traditions of childhood are stereotyped in its verses. It is the representative of a man's best moments; all that there has been about him of soft, and gentle, and pure, and penitent, and good, speaks to him for ever out of his English Bible.'

2. Moreover, the Bible has shown its power among us, both on the individual and on the national, life. It has been a sword to pierce the conscience, a hammer to break the hard heart, a fire in men's bones to kindle a passion for all that is noblest and best. As multitudes could testify, it has brought light to them that sat in darkness, and the opening of the prison to them that were the bond-slaves of sin. It has made the drunkard sober, the scoffer devout, the miser generous, and the timid brave. It has inspired the young, and cheered the aged; it has comforted the mourner, and kept hope burning in the deepest gloom. In a word, it has made men and women strong to live and serve and suffer and die, because it has given them the assurance of a Heavenly Father, an all-sufficient Saviour, and an eternal home.

It has been the conscience of our nation, has rebuked our national sins, and given to our national character a deep seriousness which is among its finest qualities. Through its influence we have been blessed with a succession of Christian statesmen who, however they might be divided in their practical politics, had a sense of responsibility to God in all that they did. Without going beyond living memory, one might instance Gladstone, of whom his great rival, Lord Salisbury, said that he had done more than any other man of his time to 'keep alive the soul in England,' and following him, one might make an impressive list of the great statesmen, soldiers, and proconsuls of our Empire, who, as many of their biographies clearly show, guided their thought and nourished their hearts upon the English Bible. Particularly in the terrible years of the War it was significant that the leading statesmen, soldiers, and sailors, the men who brought the nation through, were men of this type.

And what is true of our nation is also true of other countries and peoples. The Bible makes itself equally at home among them, and shows its power to uplift them in proportion as they receive its holy truth. Luther's Bible made its way to the heart of the German people and saturated their literature as the English Bible has done with us. The Bible has now been translated into many hundred different languages, into the tongues of some of the most degraded races of the earth, and wherever it has gone it has made itself intelligible. It has, in short, a strange power of appeal to the universal human heart. As a Hindu said after having read the New Testament for the first time—'He that made this Book, made my heart.' And what power it has shown to redeem and uplift! Captain Cook said of the South Sea Islanders, and Darwin said of the Tierra del Fuegans, that they were too brutish ever to be civilized, and yet among both of these degraded races some of the most signal triumphs of the gospel have been won. Who is there, who, if told that some community of cannibals had taken to the Bible and were seriously giving heed to its message, would not expect to hear next that they were abandoning their savage ways, building houses, cultivating their fields, and observing the rules of truth and righteousness and Christian love? We should confidently expect such results to follow, and we have ceased to wonder at them, but they are very wonderful, and indeed unique.

3. They are evidence that the Bible is manifestly the Word of the living God. As such the Apostle Paul preached it to the Thessalonians, 'not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God.' St. Peter also, referring to the Word of the Lord which endureth for ever, continues, 'and this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.' The Bible authenticates itself to the candid mind; it speaks to the soul with a divine authority which needs not to lean on human argumentation; it has in itself a power to convince and convert. This was what the Reformers had in view when they claimed for all men the right of private judgment. 'Put the Bible into the hands of the people,' they said, 'and let it have its way with them.' This claim has been much criticised as if it gave licence to every man to hold his own peculiar views. But what the Reformers meant was that as the eye which is turned to the sun will be filled with light, so the mind honestly exposed to the Word of God will, by the blessing of the divine Spirit dwelling therein, be filled with divine truth. Never has this been more nobly expressed than by Robertson Smith, who in his day was challenged as to his loyalty to the Bible: 'If I am asked why I receive Scripture as the Word of God and as the only perfect rule of faith and life, I answer with all the Fathers of the Protestant Church, "Because the Bible is the only record of the redeeming love of God, because in the Bible alone I find God drawing near to man in Christ Jesus and declaring His will to us for our salvation." And this record I know to be true by the witness of His Spirit in my heart, whereby I am assured that none other than God Himself is able to speak such words to my soul.'

We may think to sit in judgment on the Word of God, but in reality it judges us and the world. Individuals and nations stand or fall by its judgments. Its way is the way of life and peace; it is given as a light to men, which if the world refuse it is doomed to revert to chaos and night. It is therefore a most alarming prospect when we look out upon the world to-day and see the Bible, which we were wont to think had now free course in every land, once again banned as in Russia, Mexico, and other parts. No less alarming is it to note that the English Bible does not now influence our national life and character as powerfully as in former times. Do we not at the same time mark a serious fall in the moral temperature of the world—oaths broken without scruple, solemn treaties torn up, and war made more devilish than ever; while in private life chastity is laughed at, and claims are made for an absolutely free indulgence of every passion? And before us as a dread possibility is the downfall of that civilization which had for one of its chief corner-stones the Bible. Who that knows anything of the power of evil and of the passions that rage in the human heart can think without a shudder of a world cut loose from the restraints and guidance of the Word of God and driving on through the dark like a great ship without pilot or rudder, or rather one might say, of a world in which the nations, like a fleet of such rudderless ships, blindly dash one another to pieces? On the other hand, who is so blind as not to see that the highest welfare of the world is bound up with reverence for the Bible and loyalty to the truth of God contained therein?

4. With good reason, therefore, we thank God for the Bible, and commemorate the time when it was first given to us in our own tongue. And how shall we better do this than by an increased reverence and more earnest study of it, and by encouraging the young to study it too? John Ruskin, in telling how his mother made him learn great passages of the Bible by heart, declares it to have been the best part of his education, and adds—'She established my soul in life.' No study is more fitted to elevate the mind, to give stability and depth to character, to restrain from evil and inspire to good, to be a heavenly guide through these dark and perilous days. So we may confidently appeal to our people in the beautiful words of the Preface to the Authorized Version of 1611: 'Ye are brought unto fountains of living water which ye digged not. O receive not so great things in vain: O despise not so great salvation. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God; but a blessed thing it is, and will bring us to everlasting blessedness in the end, when God speaketh unto us, to hearken; when he setteth his Word before us, to read it; when he stretcheth out his hand and calleth, to answer, Here am I, here we are to do thy will, O God.'

Burnett Hillman Streeter

(1875–1937).

By the Reverend J. C. Hardwick, B.Sc., The Vicarage, Partington, Manchester.

The significance of Streeter's work cannot be understood unless its inspiration is realized. All his work was inspired by the desire to supply the educated public with a religion which they could believe and practise without intellectual reservations. He had always been convinced that religion, whether in its mystical, emotional, or practical expression, was 'of little value if divorced from intellectual integrity.' Such integrity he saw to be a *moral* quality, and as such an indispensable condition for any healthy and vigorous religious life.

But Streeter's special place as a Christian apologist owes everything to the circumstance that he was not, primarily, either a philosopher (though he took a First in 'Greats') or a scientist, but a *Biblical student*—and more especially a student of the New Testament, the critical part of the Bible for Christians.

It is highly important to remember, though the fact is often conveniently forgotten, that by far the gravest difficulties for traditional orthodoxy spring not from the results of modern scientific research or philosophical speculation, *but from the results of the modern critical study of the Bible, and especially of the New Testament.* And, of course, in the New Testament itself it is the Gospels which are crucial; and Streeter, with the possible exception of the late Dr. F. C. Burkitt, of Cambridge, was the leading authority in England on the study of the Gospels.

It should be remembered that it is quite possible, not to say easy, to work out a more or less tenable and more or less orthodox Christian position upon the basis supplied by almost any philosophy of an idealist colour. Streeter himself in his early days was influenced by T. H. Green and Illingworth, and Oxford Hegelianism has always, theologically speaking, been respectable. If some 'Greats' men have become sceptics, others have become bishops. The gradient up to orthodoxy from any metaphysic tracing its ancestry to Plato is an easy one.

But this easy gradient was not the one travelled by Streeter in spite of his First in 'Greats.' When, after taking his degree, he turned his attention to Theology, it was history at first that engaged him. But finding Church history dull (not being, as he found out later, genuine history at all, but a form of propaganda), he tackled Textual Criticism. That was the turning-point in his career.

Streeter gained a First in Theology, took Holy Orders, and became Dean and Theological Tutor of Pembroke in 1899, being elected to a fellowship at his old college, Queen's, six years later. By this time the influence of Driver and Sanday had made of the Oxford Honours School of Theology an intellectual discipline based on the study of facts, historical and documentary, and not merely the manipulation of *a priori* theories. It was not many years before this young theological tutor, both as a teacher and as a leading member of Sanday's Seminar on the Gospels, was able to speak with authority on matters more highly crucial for orthodoxy than any that the scientists and philosophers were discussing. Two of his essays were included in an important volume edited by Sanday in 1911—*Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem.* But it was in the following year that the full results of Streeter's studies in the Gospels became evident: he edited the volume called *Foundations,* which in its way created as great a stir as *Lux Mundi* some twenty years before.

The object of the book—a collection of essays on theological subjects, by seven Oxford scholars of the younger generation, four of whom afterwards became bishops—was apologetic; the writers' purpose was to recondition traditional theology.

> 'The world is calling for religion,' declared Streeter's Introduction, 'but it cannot accept a religion if its theology is out of harmony with science, philosophy, and scholarship. Religion, if it is to dominate life, must satisfy both the head and the heart, a thing which neither obscurantism nor rationalism can do.'

Streeter's own essay was the most striking of the collection, and attracted most of the hostile fire which the volume drew upon itself. Its title, 'The Historic Christ,' showed that at least one of the essayists was ready to examine objectively those historical events out of which the Christian religion took its origin. The title showed also that the author was not prepared to sacrifice either the Jesus of History to the Christ of Faith (in the manner of modern Anglican 'form-critics'), nor yet to adopt the opposite expedient favoured by such scholars as Loisy—to relegate the Christ of Faith to the realm of fancy.

The essay, which cost Streeter a couple of examining chaplaincies, was brilliant, learned, and highly readable—as indeed was everything that he wrote. The point about it was that it accepted, with some necessary reservations, the apocalyptic standpoint of Schweitzer whose *Quest of the Historical Jesus* had been published the previous year. This view was anathema to the 'liberals' of the Harnack tradition, who held that the last word had been spoken in *Das Wesen des Christentums*, and to whose camp Streeter might have been supposed to belong. The recent studies of Dr. Charles had supplied material for a lucid and convincing account of the Messianism which was the background of the ministries of the Baptist and of Jesus, and this brilliant popularization of the new researches startled every one.

> 'From the point of view of a purely historical interpretation the advance made by the Eschatological School is threefold. Firstly, it approaches the subject not from the standpoint of the twentieth century, but from one which recent discovery has shown to have been normal in the Judæa of our Lord's own time. Secondly, it can accept at their full face value all the sayings of our Lord reported in the Synoptic Gospels. . . . Thirdly, the "great gulf" supposed . . . to have been fixed between the Christology of St. Paul and that of the Twelve simply disappears. . . .
>
> 'From the point of view of religion the gain seems to be no less. . . . The Christ whom this newer school reveals is a solitary arresting figure, intensely human, yet convinced of His call to an office and a mission absolutely superhuman—a conviction which one will attribute to fanaticism, another to inspiration—calling men to follow Him along a path which to some will appear the way of folly, to others the way of life. He came not to bring peace but division, and to "separate them one from another as a shepherd divideth the sheep from the goats."'

Dr. Streeter at this time shared with some other distinguished Anglican scholars the conviction that if their researches were to be of value they must be free to publish their results, and not be hampered in this by ecclesiastical authority. It was undoubtedly with the intention of challenging interference from the then Bishop of Oxford, Dr. Gore (who was disposed to limit Anglican scholars' freedom to the limits set by his own work, *Lux Mundi*—limits the latitude of which had shocked Liddon to death), that Streeter included in his essay a full exposition of his views on the Resurrection of Christ. In his view the appearances were to be explained on the theory, not of a resuscitated body but of 'objective' visions, *i.e.* visions 'directly caused by the Lord Himself veritably alive and personally in communion with' those who experienced them.

A couple of years after this spirited manifesto, the War broke out bringing with it a moratorium for all intellectual liabilities. One of the few who did not take advantage of this permission to put thought into cold storage was Streeter, who felt that religious problems had become more pressing than before. His view extended far beyond the study and lecture-room to the anxious and bereaved homes of his countrymen whose need for a religion that met the demands of life, now so cruel and appalling, was more urgent than ever.

In 1916 appeared the first of those composite volumes edited by Streeter, and emanating from Miss Lily Dougall's house at Cumnor—*Concerning Prayer*—to which Streeter contributed two essays, 'God and the World's Pain' and 'Worship.' The year following a companion volume, *Immortality*, was published, and for this also Streeter wrote on 'The Resurrection of the Dead' and 'The Life of the World to Come.' Then, soon after the War, appeared the third of these books of positive and vital Christian apologetic—*The Spirit*.

Hitherto it might have been thought by those not fully acquainted with the facts that Streeter was nothing but an extremely able popularizer of other men's views gifted with a certain degree of originality, moral fervour, and spiritual insight. But Streeter, though he was all this, was also a good deal more. After the War he settled down again to the central interest of his life—the study of the Gospels, and in 1924 his *magnum opus*, *The Four Gospels: A Study in Origins*, appeared. This was not only a work of great erudition and a masterly survey of the results of the critical study of the Gospels (it is the only work written by an English scholar that was thought worthy of mention by Loisy in his *Naissance du Christianisme*), but contained at least one important and original contribution to the study of the Gospels. It is characteristic of Streeter's work and outlook, that this contribution should have been one of a definitely *positive* kind, adding to, and not subtracting from, the historicity and reliability of the Gospel records. In this book the hypothesis is put forward of the existence of a second independent historical source in addition to the usually accepted one, *Mark*, that is to say 'Proto-Luke.' The Gospel of *Luke* was thus not wholly dependent upon *Mark* for historical material, as was *Matthew*. *Q*, of course, was accepted by Streeter as a source used by both the first and third evangelists, but this source has always been regarded as authoritative for *sayings* of Jesus, rather than for historical *events*; thus Streeter's hypothesis, if sound, did increase the historical reliability of the Gospel record of happenings, tracing them to two sources instead of one. Furthermore, Streeter's treatment of the Fourth Gospel in this book, though necessarily less adequate than his treatment of the Synoptic Gospels, was reassuring to those (and they were many) who regarded with misgiving all attempts to demonstrate its non-apostolic authorship.

Streeter attributes the Gospel to 'John the Elder,' a disciple of the Apostle, and dates it from A.D. 90–95. He points out that its author enabled Christianity to achieve 'an intellectual adaptation to its environment, which saved it from becoming merged in the general welter of syncretistic religion, before the generation brought up in Jewish ethical monotheism had died out.' The doctrine of the Logos 'was the boldest "restatement" of Christianity in terms of contemporary thought ever attempted in the history of the Church.'

Streeter's treatment of the whole theme was calculated to win acceptance, in spite of his rejection of the Apostolic authorship, even from devout and conservative minds. 'The Gospel,' he observes, 'belongs neither to History nor Biography, but to the Library of Devotion.'

> 'It will be misunderstood unless it is approached in a spirit comparable to that in which we approach the *Confessions* of Augustine or the *Imitation* of à Kempis. We must read it, as we read the book of Job, with our attention fixed less on the events recorded or on the characters of the dialogue than on the profundities of thought which through them are dramatically bodied forth. This Gospel is a meditation, an inspired meditation, on the Life of Christ.'

Under the cross-heading 'Creative Memory,' Streeter writes as follows of the evangelist's method of working:

> 'Every scene he depicts, every discourse he relates—whencesoever originally derived—is the distilled essence of something that has been pondered upon and lived out in actual life until it has become of the very texture of his soul. But the subconscious depths of the human mind are never inactive, least of all so where thoughts or incidents fraught with passionate interest are concerned. Things disconnected are brought together, things dark become illuminated. Given also a mystic with the creative imagination of the artist . . . old scenes will be flashed up into recollection, with new but vivid details embodying the altered emphasis caused by later meditation on the meaning of the original experience.
>
> '. . . The subconscious mind is more primitive than the conscious; it thinks in pictures; it dramatizes; thus every time a story is told, it is told more effectively. But that is always at the expense of the minor accuracy which a cross-examining counsel demands of a witness, and which a historical critic ought to be aware cannot often be expected in an ancient document. . . .'

Streeter was thus successful in presenting a maximum of critical results with a minimum of mental upset for his readers. Indeed, it may be said that the publication of *The Four Gospels* marks the acceptance of Streeter's (relative) orthodoxy by the great majority of Anglicans. He rendered the higher criticism of the Gospels, and its results, to a surprising degree 'tolerable' to all the better educated among the clergy. Indeed, Streeter's book acquired such a prestige that with the lapse of years it may actually prove to be an obstacle to progress by retarding research! Needless to say, such a result would have been highly distasteful to Streeter himself, who had no wish to provide new chains to replace the old ones struck off by him. This 'acceptance' by the Anglican Church of Streeter's soundness, did not, however, lead to his being offered high office in the Church whose foremost scholar he had now become. Two years after the publication of *Foundations*, Bishop Percival of Hereford offered him a Canonry, the duties of which Streeter was able to perform during the vacations. But this was the sole piece of ecclesiastical preferment of any note that he ever received. And yet had Streeter been a bishop during the years preceding 1927, it may well be that the Prayer Book fiasco would not have taken place. At least, Streeter's influence on the bench of bishops would certainly have been exerted in favour of making the Revision less reactionary. His election as Fellow of the British Academy, however, as a result of *The Four Gospels*, would be generally recognized as a greater distinction than promotion to the episcopate.

Although his most important and original work was done on the Synoptic problem, Streeter never ceased to take an interest in the philosophical basis of religion, and also in developments in the different sciences, especially with reference to their bearing upon religious theory and practice. In particular did psychological science attract him. He was deeply interested also in art and in æsthetic theory, and especially in the relationship between religion and art, which he saw to be far closer than the corresponding relationship between religion and science. Thus, it was not at all surprising that he followed up his *magnum opus* on the Gospels with a work of popular apologetic, in which he gave expression to ideas which had been occupying his mind for many years. This work, *Reality* (1926), which Streeter's gifts of lucid exposition caused to reach a very wide circle of readers, was characteristically vigorous and constructive. Already in the Introduction a breeze of fresh air blows from the outside world through the musty atmosphere of the study :

> 'Instinctively any one brought up in the Christian tradition frames his question in the form, Is Christianity true ? But merely to state the question thus precludes a satisfactory answer ; for the very form of the question implies that Religion is itself the problem, whereas the truth of Religion is a matter worth inquiring about only if, and in so far as, it offers a solution of the problems which are posed by life. . . .
>
> 'Life has not ceased to pose its riddle ; but who to-day has an answer which to the majority seems to have the authentic ring ? Those who are without Religion admit that they have no answer. The Christian theologian stands on the defensive. Having once begun by asking the wrong question, he finds himself "defending the faith" ; in effect, he has got himself into the position of being anxious to save Religion instead of expecting Religion to save him.'

Streeter would not call his book a 'Defence of Christianity,' admitting that in Christianity as traditionally presented there were some things he would be more inclined to attack than defend. 'It is an attempt to discover Truth' was all that he would say of his work's purpose.

Of course Pilate's question remains to be answered, and Streeter gives Professor S. Alexander's reply to it :

> 'Truth and reality are not identical conceptions. Truth is reality possessed by mind. . . . For truth is not reality itself, but the reality as the investigator possesses it.'

Human beings fortunately are equipped with more than one device for coming into contact with, or possession of, reality. There is in the first place Science, which supplies a diagram of portions of reality, which it conceives of in terms of quantity. Then there is Art, and also Religion, which supply something in the nature of a picture of reality, and conceive of it in terms of quality. But as quality can only be *felt*, the kind of knowledge provided by Art and Religion is necessarily somewhat different in kind from that supplied by Science.

Religion, unfortunately, sometimes also professes to provide the same kind of truth as that provided by Science, just as Art sometimes professes to provide us with the same kind of truth as that supplied by a photograph or a blue-print. But in so doing Religion and Art are entering an alien and lower sphere. If Religion wishes to give external expression to the truths it helps us to feel, it can do so by means of myths and rites. Streeter strives to show that the Christian myth does as a matter of fact give a true picture of reality in terms of quality—especially of moral quality.

In this book Streeter also makes an interesting attempt to supply a new theory of how truth is attained in the sphere of religion—*i.e.* a new religious epistemology. For the two traditionally accepted avenues to truth—reason and revelation—he substitutes the ratiocinative and the intuitive methods.

Thus the book *Reality* was a useful contribution to the philosophy of religion, and especially in view of the sort of public who were prepared to read it—*i.e.* the Anglican clergy as well as young people of the student class all over the world. It helped to instil into their minds two important ideas : (1) That there are different kinds of truth, because there are different ways of grasping portions of reality ; (2) that the different ways of grasping reality cannot be arbitrarily divided into natural and supernatural. If we are to have watertight compartments, reason and intuition would be better terms to allot to them.

It might be thought that a man who was one of the two leading experts in England on Gospel studies, and who had a clear grasp of the problems of religious philosophy, had already displayed his share of versatility. But in addition to his other qualifications as a *savant* Streeter was also a Church historian.

His *The Primitive Church* was published in 1929, and the title-page of the volume declares that the subject is therein studied 'with special reference to the origins of the Christian Ministry'; and the author expressly alludes in his Introduction 'to the importance of that topic in relation to the present-day discussion of Christian Reunion.' It may be that Streeter entertained the hope that his book would be read by the prelates who would be attending the Lambeth Conference in the following year. Whether it was so read it is impossible to say, but that it had no visible effect upon the results of their deliberations is certain. It would seem that historical truth is not the only consideration which must guide the policy of ecclesiastical assemblies.

Streeter summarizes the results of his researches thus in an Epilogue to this volume:

> 'Whatever else is disputable, there is, I submit, one result from which there is no escape. In the Primitive Church there was no single system of Church Order laid down by the Apostles. During the first hundred years of Christianity, the Church was an organism alive and growing—changing its organization to meet changing needs. Clearly in Asia, Syria, and Rome during that century the system of government varied from church to church, and in the same church at different times. Uniformity was a later development; and for those times it was, perhaps, a necessary development.
>
> 'In a book which aims at being a contribution to historical research, a discussion of issues which are a matter of controversy in the Church of to-day would be out of place. It would, however, be futile to pretend that the historical conclusions here reached are without relevance to practical questions keenly debated at the present time. All over the world—more especially in India, China, and Africa—disunion among Christians is recognized as a force of weakness. The obstacles to be overcome are many; and they are real. . . . But perhaps the greatest obstacle is the belief—entertained more or less explicitly by most bodies of Christians—that there is some one form of Church Order which alone is primitive, and which, therefore, alone possesses the sanction of Apostolic precedent. Our review of the historical evidence has shown this belief to be an illusion. In the Primitive Church no one system of Church Order prevailed. Everywhere there was readiness to experiment, and, where circumstances seemed to demand it, to change.'

Streeter's interest in Reunion, like his interest in Christian apologetics, was by no means merely academic. He had himself travelled and lectured in India, China, and Japan, and had come into close and intimate contact with Christians, and especially with Christian students, in those countries. At home, too, his lively and active interest in the Student Christian Movement, which seems to have meant a great deal to him, and but for the inspiration of which at its Summer Conferences, he would have relinquished his Orders, showed that he sat loosely to the narrower and more arid type of institutional loyalty. Ecclesiastical pedantry was foreign to him.

Some of his friends were disturbed when, after coming into contact with the Group Movement in 1934, he associated himself actively with it. But it was not in the least surprising that his sympathies should have moved in this direction. He was interested in the young, and in vital religion wherever he saw it, and he clearly saw the great and unexplored possibilities of a group system in religious life. The first Christian group consisted of a dozen, and it is where the 'two or three' are gathered that Christ is present. The early Methodist 'Class' system had proved the efficacy of the close religious association of a few kindred spirits; clearly the optimum number for a religious group is a small one; the psychology of crowds and even perhaps of the much-desired 'large congregations' is to be distrusted. Streeter, too, with his lively interest in psychology and in the personal problems of the individual, was alive to the spiritual needs of middle-class young people, and saw that 'sharing' often gave them just what they needed most—escape from themselves and from a sense of inadequacy. He recognized that one of the chief needs of the Movement was a sound modern theology of a simple, straightforward type which he attempted to supply in his last book—*The God Who Speaks*.

The influence exercised by Streeter in his published works probably exceeded that of any other Anglican religious writer, but, in addition to this, we must take into consideration his work as a University teacher, from the date of his first Fellowship, 1899, until his death. During those thirty-eight years a very large number of men destined for the ministry in the Church of England and other religious bodies must have come under his influence. A pupil of Streeter's writes to us of his influence as a teacher as follows:

> 'For two years I enjoyed the privilege of reading with Canon Streeter for the Honours School of Theology; and, since this meant taking to him a weekly essay, the period offered abundant

opportunities for coming to know him. Fortunately for me the number of his pupils was not large; so that I always went to him alone to read, and receive his comments on, my essays.

'In some aspects of the course prescribed for the School he had little interest. Thus in Old Testament subjects he sent some of his pupils by exchange to a tutor of another college; and with Church history he resolutely refused to concern himself. But in the Gospels, the Epistles of the New Testament, and in the development of Christian doctrine, he was vitally and enthusiastically interested. From the standpoint of a pupil anxious to cover more or less adequately the main points of the rather wide syllabus, indeed, his interest in these themes was a trifle embarrassing. For he dealt out such a formidable list of essay-subjects and books for reading in these fields as to leave little time for other things.

'I well remember that, after reading my essay, Streeter would begin, slowly and hesitantly at first, and then with increasing animation as his mind kindled, to comment not only upon the particular topic, but upon all kinds of related subjects. He was never "academic" in the desiccated sense of that word, in dealing with theology. His mind was always alert to connect its several aspects with contemporary problems of faith and practice. As I came to know him better, he opened his mind on many things; and his conversation was religious as well as theological.

'Perhaps the chief profit which I received from him was the conviction of intellectual integrity and strength, as of a man who had built his beliefs upon the rock. And, as I look back upon the friendship with which he then and subsequently honoured me, I realize how much I learned of religion and life, as well as of academic knowledge, from his inspiring personality.'

There can be no doubt that Streeter, besides being a great scholar, was also a great man. Whether theological studies will in the future continue to attract men of the same mental and moral calibre seems uncertain. Yet the future influence of the churches must depend upon their doing so.

◆

Literature.

CHRISTIANITY AND MODERN KNOWLEDGE.

It has often been observed during the last thirty years or so that this is not a time for creed-making or even for constructive theology. We have been living in a 'transition period' when it has been difficult, if not impossible, to assess the value of new discoveries and ideas, or to understand their effects upon traditional doctrine. Matthew Arnold long ago insisted that a period of criticism, of winnowing, of breaking up, must precede a period of construction and the appearance of a genius. Are we coming to the end of such a critical period in theology? It is possible. At any rate, there are now and again tentative efforts being made at some kind of positive system, or at least efforts, to consider seriously the results which modern thought has for Christian faith.

One of these, and a very interesting one it is, has been made by the Chancellor of Liverpool Cathedral, the Rev. J. S. Bezzant, B.D., M.A., in *Aspects of Belief* (Nisbet; 7s. 6d. net), which contains the William Belden Noble Lectures for 1937. It is not an easy book to read, simply because it is so closely reasoned and the argument is so close knit. There is no obscurity. The style is perfectly clear. But the slovenly reader will find himself hard pressed, just because there is no waste of words and the thinking is so strenuous. Mr. Bezzant is a Modernist in his acceptance of critical and scientific conclusions. And his lectures are a brave attempt to explain what the effects of these conclusions are on the Christian belief about man, God, Jesus Christ, and the Church.

The growth and great success of scientific method and the adoption of the theory of evolution, have (the writer contends) involved an approach to the facts of life and of thought different from that which dominated the thought of the past, a method which is experimental and empirical. It may be that such empirical methods cannot take us as far as the older speculative systems, or give us the same appearance of certainty. But, at any rate, they offer a firmer basis for our inferences and even for those ventures of faith which may reasonably be made. That is the point of view from which the writer considers the doctrines mentioned above. And if we do not get as much from him as we would like, at least, we may be thankful for a contribution which is essentially positive, and we may remember that constructions such as this are tentative. We are only feeling our way towards system, if indeed it is system we are going to get.

It is inevitable that we should miss something in a work so definitely based on experience alone. If we were optimistic enough to expect any treatment of 'dogma' or 'doctrine' in the old sense, we are disappointed. Of the Catholic doctrine of the Person of Christ, for example, there is nothing. Of the Holy Trinity it must be enough to say that speculation about the nature of God as He is in His own Being transcends attainable human knowledge. It is doubtful whether such speculation is a *necessary* representation of God as disclosed in religious experience. But we need not complain of a lack which the standpoint of the writer does not enable him to supply. What we have given us is much. It is a very real reinforcement of faith. It is firm ground on which we tread. And thoughtful, inquiring religious minds will find in this book full encouragement for those 'ventures of faith' which the author himself regards as legitimate.

DOCTRINE IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

In 1922 the Archbishops of Canterbury and York appointed a Commission on Christian Doctrine. Its Report has at length been issued: *Doctrine in the Church of England* (S.P.C.K.; cloth 4s., paper 2s. 6d. net). It makes very interesting reading for those who are concerned with the theological statement of the Christian faith, and more especially for those who welcome the advance of a progressive Christian theology. It is gratifying for such to realize, as they may readily do from the pages of this book, that responsible leaders in the Church of England are alive to the tendencies of modern Christian thought and freely concede to the members of the Church of England, clergy and laity alike, the right to hold certain views which would have been ruled out as heterodox or even heretical a generation or two ago.

The Chairman of the Commission, the Archbishop of York, explains in the Introduction that the Commission does not attempt to survey the whole field of theology, much less to produce a systematic treatise, but gives most attention to those subjects which have been occasions of recent controversy within the Church of England or causes of confusion in Anglican practice. The Prolegomena treats of the sources and authority of Christian Doctrine; then are treated in the three successive parts of the book: the Doctrines of God and Redemption, the Church and Sacraments, and Eschatology. The scheme of treatment is not so much determined by the logical order of theological exposition or the psychological order of personal apprehension as by the contemporary situation within the Church of England. Which chiefly accounts for the fact that nearly one-half of the book is devoted to the section on the Church and Sacraments, the doctrine of the Sacraments bulking largely. The case would be different in a similar Report presented by a Commission of the Church of Scotland or one of the Free Churches of Great Britain.

One feature of the Report that strikes us in the perusal is the emphasis laid on the possibly symbolical character of certain traditional Christian beliefs. It is part of the aforesaid concession to a more liberal standpoint in Christian theology. By a symbolical statement is meant in this connexion, a statement affirming a particular fact which has value as a pictorial expression of a spiritual truth, even though the supposed fact itself did not actually happen. Accordingly, it is not 'of necessity illegitimate to accept and affirm particular clauses of the Creeds while understanding them in this symbolic sense.' But the safeguarding words are added: 'It is, however, in any case essential to hold that the facts underlying the Gospel story—which story the Creeds summarize and interpret—were such as to justify the Gospel itself.'

The notion of symbol is recognized, of course, as having wider application than to Credal statements. Thus it is said: 'No objection to a theory of evolution can be drawn from the two Creation narratives in Gn i. and ii., since it is generally agreed among educated Christians that these are mythological in origin, and that their value for us is symbolic rather than historical.' Or again: 'It is legitimate for a Christian . . . to interpret the language, whether of Scripture or of the Church's Liturgy, with regard to angels and demons in a purely symbolical sense.'

But the most important application of the notion of symbol, from the point of view of Christian doctrine, is its application to credal statements, as in the doctrines of the Virgin Birth and Physical Resurrection as affirmed in the Apostles' Creed. On the first doctrine, that of the Virgin Birth, it should be noted that while all the members of the

Commission fully accept the reality of the Word made flesh, 'which is the central truth of the Christian faith,' some among them do not regard that truth as integrally bound up with belief in the Virgin Birth. They would, however, look upon the Virgin Birth as a symbol of the Incarnation.

As for the doctrine of Physical Resurrection, take it only in relation to the life of Christ. While the members of Commission agree that the story of the empty tomb symbolizes the fact of Jesus having risen from the dead, they are not all agreed in holding the traditional explanation, namely, 'that the tomb was empty because the Lord had risen.' Thus the minority of the Commission would refer the connexion made in the New Testament between the emptiness of a tomb and the appearances of the Risen Lord 'rather to the sphere of religious symbolism than to that of historical fact.'

It should perhaps be added that, as we noted in our February number, the Archbishop of York declares his own wholehearted acceptance as historical facts both of the Virgin Birth and the Physical Resurrection of Jesus, in this refusing to align himself with liberal theology in two of its characteristic qualifications of the traditional theology.

We commend the whole volume to our readers as marking an epoch in Anglican doctrine.

GREAT PREACHING.

Volumes of sermons do not occupy the place they used to in current religious literature. Comparatively few sermons see the light of publication. The interest of the religious public seems to be centred rather in matters of apologetic. It is problems we are concerned with to-day. Partly, doubtless, owing to the uncertainty created by the negations of scientists and moralists, and partly owing to the fluid condition of religious thinking in this age of transition. There is, however, always a place and a welcome for great preaching. And Messrs. T. & T. Clark have done a real service by their 'Scholar as Preacher' series. The long list of contributors is notable for the distinction of the names included. Among these are Professor Zahn, Dean Inge, Dr. Gossip, Archdeacon Charles, Dr. W. M. Macgregor, Dr. Hugh R. Mackintosh, Dr. W. P. Paterson, Dr. James Moffatt, and Dr. Hastings Rashdall. It is a brilliant company. But it may be questioned whether any of the former volumes has a greater title to distinction than the latest, *The Gates of New Life*, by the Rev. James S. Stewart, B.D. (7s. net).

Mr. Stewart vindicated his scholarship by his Cunningham Lectures on Pauline Christology. He has vindicated his place among the great preachers in this volume. It is aptly named, for its main appeal is to youth. He knows the problems and difficulties of youth, and he is not afraid to state clearly and strongly the case against faith. But he has something to say about this which is reasonable and which must have sounded reasonable to the most critical of his hearers. There is nothing trivial in these sermons. We suffer too often to-day from 'clever' sermons on clever little texts, or from catchpenny titles meant to attract the indifferent. Do such tactics really attract them? At any rate, here in these sermons we have always and only great themes. The eternal issues of life are presented fairly and squarely by one who is alive to their vital urgency and who knows the moral and religious situation that faces youth to-day.

One thing must be said about these sermons particularly. The preacher is not only well-furnished intellectually. He has himself a passionate faith in Christ. Wherever he begins he always ends with Christ. And everywhere we find the note of deep conviction. It is not emotion, though emotion is there. It is simple, enlightened, assured, confident faith. And there is no power in preaching like that. Here, we can imagine his hearers saying to themselves, is a man who knows and who also believes. Dr. Denney once said of preaching that it often had good bait but no hook. These sermons have the hook. The preacher's own certainty becomes a plea for decision. We are always faced with the pressure of God on our souls. In that all-important matter these sermons may show other preachers the way.

THE EARLY HISTORY OF ISRAEL.

In *The Fulness of Israel* (Milford; 8s. 6d. net) Canon W. J. Phythian-Adams has developed and continued the line taken in 'The Call of Israel.' The new book consists of six lectures, originally delivered under the terms of the Warburton Trust in the years 1935–1937. The chapters are entitled: 'The Church and the World,' 'The Book of Old Israel,' 'The Call of Israel,' 'Exodus,' 'Success and Undoing,' and 'Servitude.' There is also a sketch map illustrating Chapter III. The author's views on the early history of Israel—we might almost say the prehistory of Israel—will be familiar to most of his readers. Into the exposition of the Patriarchal Age he has introduced a good deal of material made available by recent archæology, developing, in particular, a theory of Hurrian influence. He still holds to the view that the events of the Exodus were due to a volcanic outbreak, and carries the theory so far as to suggest that the plagues of Egypt were due, in the first instance, to pollution of the Nile by some convulsion far up its course. Like others (including even Gressmann), however, who adopt this type of explanation, he fails to give adequate ground for the theory. While it is beyond dispute that the whole region to the east of the Great Rift is volcanic, no evidence as to the geological period is adduced, and readers have a right to ask for the evidence. Modern lava beds are to be found in the area of the Hauran in the north, and in that of the Harras in the south. The theory adopted by Canon Phythian-Adams may be correct, but before it can claim general acceptance, it must supply either direct literary evidence from Egypt or adequate assurance by competent geological authorities that there has been fairly extensive volcanic activity in the neighbourhood of the Gulf of Akaba *within historic times*, *i.e.* in the most recent geological period. Another weakness (shared by Professor Garstang's work) is to be seen in the reconstruction of the history between Joshua and Samuel, and the confidence placed on the chronology of Judges. Granted that Jericho fell *c.* 1400 B.C., the mention of four hundred and eighty years in 1 K 6[1] must be regarded as an accidental coincidence. Knowing, as we do, that even the Biblical figures given for the eighth century kings of Israel are in almost hopeless confusion, it is difficult to believe that those relating to a period seven centuries earlier have been transmitted with substantial accuracy. Further, Dr. Phythian-Adams would have us believe that the great mass of the Israelite people during the age of the monarchy was on a far higher moral and religious level than is generally supposed. This view is in direct contradiction, not only of the attitude taken by the prophets (whose testimony the author seeks to minimize), but also of archæological evidence now available, and of the psychological factors which must have played a large part in the spiritual history of Israel. At the same time, the whole presentation of the story of the people is vitiated by the failure to give adequate recognition to the constant interaction of the two social and economic orders which continued to exist side by side in Israel at least down to 586 B.C.

On the other hand, it is difficult to speak too highly of the general tone, purpose, and outlook of this book. Chapters 1, 2, and 6 form a noble exposition of the divine plan for the redemption of humanity. Canon Phythian-Adams's orientation of all Biblical history to Jesus strikes the keynote for the whole work. His analogy between the story of Israel and that of the Church may seem fanciful at first sight, but, presented in his brilliant rhetorical style, these parts of the book, and especially the last chapter, will make an irresistible appeal to every serious reader. It is indeed time that we were called back to the ancient truth that the whole Church is the 'Servant of the Lord,' that she (and her members) must be crucified with Christ, that she must 'go to Him without the camp, bearing His shame.'

J AND E.

Old Testament critics have long entertained doubts as to the unity and homogeneity of the older portions of Gn 1–11, and numerous attempts have been made at further analysis. Dillmann felt that the northern tradition was represented in these chapters, as well as the southern and priestly. Budde and others, notably Eissfeldt, have isolated several strands within the J thread, and now we have a searching discussion of the whole problem from the Norwegian scholar, Sigmund Mowinckel—*The Two Sources of the Predeuteronomic Primeval History* (*JE*) *in Gen. 1–11* (Avhandlinger utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo: II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse 1937, No. 2; Kr.5.00). Like his predecessors, he is conscious of a number of discrepancies and doublets, especially in the treatment of Cain. With these as his starting-point, he skilfully disentangles two main threads of narrative. They are largely parallel to one another—the one, A, has (1) the Creation, (2) the Paradise story, (3) Cain and Abel, (4) the List of the First Men, (5) the Giants' arrogance and Yahweh's intervention, (6) the Dispersal of Mankind, (7) the Husbandman Noah and his three sons, (8) the Genealogy of the sons of Noah, (9) the Transition to the story of Abraham. B does not mention the Giants or the Dispersal of Mankind, but does include the Flood; otherwise it is generally parallel to A, though sometimes taking a very different point of view. Closer examination shows that the A strand is to be identified with J, and the B strand with E. Mowinckel then discusses the Babylonian matter to be found in the two strata. The Nimrod notice is the only J passage for which he finds a Babylonian origin, but E has borrowed the Flood story from Mesopotamian sources. The Eastern elements were not, as is commonly supposed, introduced into Palestine in pre-Israelite times and taken over from the Canaanites by Hebrew tradition. On the contrary, they became current only in the latter part of the Hebrew monarchy.

As was to be expected, Mowinckel has argued his case with learning and skill—incidentally, he writes unexceptionable English—but there are weaknesses in his position. The attribution of the earlier Flood narrative to E would appear, on the surface, to mean that the divine names must be abandoned as a criterion for distinguishing J and E in Genesis. Mowinckel is aware of the difficulty, and meets it by reference to the text of the LXX (p. 57 f.), but his reasoning is not conclusive, and the reader may feel at times that the author himself is not wholly convinced. On the whole, the theory of different southern strata still seems preferable. Further, in assigning a late date to the entry of the Babylonian elements into Israelite tradition, Mowinckel fails to allow for other aspects of Israelite life and thought. We know, for instance, that a creation-myth similar to that of Babylon was current in Israel, though it is hardly represented in the official account of the beginning of things. The basis of Israelite law, too, is similar to that found in Mesopotamia at the beginning of the second millennium B.C., and, as Jirku has shown, the Book of the Covenant represents a more primitive form of that law than the Code of Hammurabi. The only possible conclusion seems to be that it was known and generally accepted in Palestine before the end of the third millennium B.C., and that it reached the Israelites *via* their Canaanite predecessors. If the civil law came thus to Israel, surely it is not improbable that the mythology followed the same route? It may be admitted that the Flood story finds no place in what has survived of the earliest J stratum, but Mowinckel's is not the only possible solution. Yet even those who disagree with his conclusions will welcome this clearly stated and closely reasoned discussion of the facts.

BUDDHIST SECTS OF JAPAN.

For those who are interested in Eastern thought, and especially in Buddhism, here comes a delightful book—*The Buddhist Sects of Japan*, by E. Steinilber-Oberlin, translated by M. Logé (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net).

Every one knows that the permutations and combinations of thought in that protean faith are even more astonishing than the variety in Christianity. There seems to be a great gulf fixed between the splendours of Rome and the simplicity (some might say the uncouthnesses) of the Salvation Army; between the Sacramentalism of the High Churchman and the Quakers, with their, to him, barren services and truncated creed. And yet, beneath the staring differences, all are united by deep and central and underlying truths, common to them all. But the varying creeds and practices within the one all-embracing reverence for Buddha are far more staggering. It is a long, long way from the passionate human struggle for salvation—with a pathfinder but no saviour—and with every faculty of mind and will clenched in strained concentration on the task of breaking through in one's own strength, so characteristic of the Hinayana, to the purely evangelical faith in divine grace and forgiveness as the sole hope for a sinful suffering mankind, as held by the Jodo and the Shinshu sects; or from the somewhat self-centred ideal of the Arahat to the ecstasy of self-sacrifice which is the goal of the Bodhisattva, and yet all alike are Buddhists, owing everything to that teacher.

A very striking instance of all this is, of course, found in the famous sects of Japan with their extraordinarily diverse philosophies, and rites, and concepts of salvation, and how it must be reached; among which it is not easy for a stranger to pick his way without blundering and confusion of mind. Helpful books exist, like Fujishima's, or Eliot's well-known studies. But none will prove a better introduction, and more than an introduction, into these matters for the Western mind, than this new work. It is written by one who, living among the Buddhist monks, has learned greatly to love and reverence them. It consists of statements of the various positions, and quotations from the sacred Scriptures of each sect, and so on; but especially of conversations with recognized Japanese authorities upon each sect—men with the right to speak for their respective communities—with question and answer, put and returned, with pertinence and shrewdness and friendly freedom. Whether they altogether satisfy one is another matter. But one must rise up from the book with a real liking for the author and an increased respect and admiration for the Buddhist scholars and the Buddhist saints.

IMMORTALITY.

More than thirty years ago Count Hermann Keyserling published his *Unsterblichkeit*. A second edition appeared in 1910 and a third in 1920, and the Oxford University Press has now issued a translation of it from the third edition by Jane Marshall under the title *Immortality* (10s. 6d. net). The book is described in the subtitle as 'A Critique of the Relations between the Process of Nature and the World of Man's Ideas.' It does not profess to be anything more than a critical phenomenology, expressly confined to the realm of possible scientific experience. It abstracts throughout from the purely metaphysical. So that the reader who goes to it under the assumption that the author endeavours to tell us something about what suprasensible reality is 'in itself' will meet with disappointment.

The author takes us into his confidence in the Preface in a manner not altogether reassuring. He tells us that he was out of sympathy with his book by the time the second edition was called for, but that the spiral course of inner development has brought him quite near to its standpoint again. Only he could not have written the book now. He has passed beyond the stage of knowledge which it represents. It should, however, appeal to those who are still seeking to penetrate from the outward to the inward, who behold the metaphysically real but have not yet inwardly apprehended it. Thus his book should be regarded, and should serve, as a signpost upon the spiritual way.

The titles of his chapters may indicate the wide range of the discussions: Of Immortality in General, The Thought of Death, The Problem of Belief, Duration and Being-Eternal, Consciousness, Man and Mankind, Individual and Life.

So widely does the writer range in the course of his critique of the notion of Immortality, and so many judgments does he cite or express, that his book contains much that is open to question. Take at random two statements, neither of which would commend itself to the student of the Old Testament: 'Jahveh was, in his youth, a daring knight-errant, comparable to Siegfried rather than Wotan'; or again, 'Original sin indeed represents the most profound, if not the only profound, metaphysical thought of the Old Testament.'

On the other hand, the writer astonishes us by the scope and variety of his learning and intrigues us by his mental agility, displayed so often in unexpected collocations of ideas and beliefs. One lays down the book, after perusing even less than a single chapter, with a sense at once of satisfaction and no little bewilderment. For he is a writer extremely difficult to 'place.'

Here is a characteristic passage which gives an impression of the central teaching which he would convey (the Bergsonian and pantheistic flavour is obvious): 'Life is Becoming, motion. Every concrete thing comes into being only to pass away. One moment is the grave of another. So, too, one species is the grave of another. The types, which once prevailed in the world, to-day exist no longer. We men, too, shall one day be forgotten. And yet Life urges us onward, irresistibly and consciously. Our ideal lies in the remotest future, in a future which perhaps lies beyond the race of Man. . . . All races pursue their own extinction. What is it which abides in the unceasing flux, the abiding for which they live, for which they toil, for the eternal continuance of which they long?—It is not the temporal types, races, and kinds; it is the eternal Life itself.'

I SPEAK FOR THE CHINESE.

There is no doubt at all about Mr. Carl Crow's first-hand knowledge of his subject. *I Speak for the Chinese* (Hamish Hamilton; 3s. 6d. net) is not only a thoroughly well-informed account of the relations between Japan and China from the time of 'the twenty-one demands' until the present war, but one feels that it is a fair account. Mr. Crow has been much in China for the last twenty-five years, and he was appointed by the American Government as Far-Eastern Representative of the Committee of Public Information during the War. In 1915 he happened to be in Tokyo, and his account of the part that he himself played in making public 'the twenty-one demands' is as thrilling as any detective novel.

In a book which contains only a little over one hundred and thirty pages it is not possible to do more than give an outline of events, but Mr. Crow does let us see what lies behind them—the reasons for the Japanese policy. There is the jealousy between the Japanese Army and Navy; the divinity of the Emperor is interpreted in such a way that any act committed by a subject of Japan for the glory of the Emperor finds entire justification in the eyes of all his fellow-countrymen; then, again, there is an absolutely sincere belief that all their conquests are in self-defence.

Mr. Crow leaves us with the question: After China, what? 'Suppose that Japan wins this war of conquest. She will then have possession of all of China, but will she be secure? That she will be is not a reasonable assumption, for her southern outposts would be seriously menaced by the heavily fortified British colony of Hong-Kong. From here the British could at any time dispossess her of the rich and populous city of Canton and control the trade and shipping of South China. By the time she was confronted with this problem, Japan, in possession of China, would control about one-third of the population of the world.

'Hong-Kong could not be securely held without possession of Singapore, the Dutch East Indies, and the Philippines—and so, if we follow the Japanese justification for conquest and expansion, we find ourselves in a series of vicious consequences to which there can be no logical end.'

A most fascinating and enlightening volume has been issued through Messrs. Allen & Unwin, containing a series of broadcast talks given in the spring of 1937. The title is *The Population Problem: The Experts and the Public* (5s. net). The talks were in dialogue form, with Mr. T. H. Marshall as interlocutor. Chapters are contributed by Professor A. M. Carr-Saunders, Mr. H. D. Henderson, Mr. R. R. Kuczynski, and Professor Arnold Plant. Four representatives of the public were invited to give their views—a clerk in London, two women from a Yorkshire mill, and a man from a depressed area in Wales. Shoals of letters from the public completed the material. The causes of the fall in the birth-rate, its results, its cure, are all thoroughly explored, and Mr. Marshall sums up. This is a book which everybody should read. Here are two facts. In 1770 the average length of a white person's life was thirty years. To-day it is sixty years. That is one. Here is the other, not so much a fact as a scientific prediction. If the average size of the English family remains what it is now, the population will soon begin to decline, and in a century from now it will be about half its present size.

India Calling, by the Rev. Charles Winsland, B.D. (Allenson; 3s. 6d. net), is a light-hearted book upon serious subjects. Mr. Winsland has no need to pray for a sense of humour, but he would be none the worse of a keener power of discrimination between good jokes and bad. Some of his pleasantries are quite out of place, as, for example, when he interprets the Hindu doctrine of 'one-pointedness' as the concentration of the contemplative on the point of his nose. His judgments do not suggest any great depth of knowledge, and he has, on several subjects, failed to liberate himself from the purely conventional attitude of many Europeans in India. His knowledge of Hinduism and Muhammadanism is discursive, and he is more favourably impressed by the latter than by the former. His description of Buddhism is accurate as far as it goes, but does not go very far. His treatment of the Anglo-Indian problem is based upon direct acquaintance with this community, which he aptly describes as 'the Cinderella of modern India,' and is really the only chapter which justifies the publication of the book. But even here his bitterness prevents the facts from producing effectively the impression which they ought to make.

His views on politics do not rise far above the usual level of club-chat. He reproduces the well-worn observation about the educated being an insignificant minority—and noisy and dangerous at that—without considering that the influence of the educated minority is perhaps greater in India than in any other part of the world, and that certain leaders of the people have been capable of sacrifices which have made the world wonder. The Nationalists, according to him, are mostly briefless lawyers, and he overlooks the fact that some of them are men of independent means, not at all dependent on their profession, and that one at least, on his interpretation of the demands of principle, resigned from the I.C.S., which is not usually considered to be, as a Service, the last resort of the destitute. Again, he considers that the publication by itself of Volume I. of the Simon Report was 'a masterpiece of political strategy,' whereas the contrary opinion, that it was a political blunder of the first magnitude, was held by many people quite competent to judge the situation. Mr. Winsland hopes that his book may be used by study-circles; we hope that no study-circle will be surrendered without protection to its guidance. With reference to the title, did not a book with this same title, written by Cornelia Sorabji, appear only a few years ago?

Those who are practically interested in the conduct of children's worship should procure *Little Church at Worship*, by the Rev. Zia Bentley (H. V. Capsey, Ludgate Circus House, London; 2s. 6d. net). It records the result of an experiment in leading the minds of children in worship, and also illustrates the spirit in which it should be conducted. Orders of service are given, but also no less than twenty examples of how the thing was done in the 'Little Church.' It would be difficult to name another book so full of real guidance and help in this highly important matter. The author not only loves children but has entered into their minds in a way and to an extent that amount to genius.

A memorial volume containing selected and characteristic writings of the late Rev. H. J. Wotherspoon, D.D., has been published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark—*What Happened at Pentecost* (5s. net). Dr. Wotherspoon was a well-known and much respected clergyman of the Church of Scotland. His doctrine and practice were 'high,' and he had all the qualities usually associated with that school, catholic orthodoxy in belief and a profoundly devout spirit. Both of these characteristics are illustrated in the discourses printed in this book, the first half of which is occupied with a statement of the catholic faith, the second with essays on various aspects of the devotional life. Anonymous editors have prefixed to the selections a fairly full biography.

The Reverend Mitchell Hughes has the gift of writing well for children. In addition to that he has hit upon a really good and fresh idea in *The Bible Puzzle Book* (James Clarke & Co.; 3s. 6d. net), so this provides a fine variety to the usual book of children's addresses. Each chapter tells an Old Testament story but omits the names. At the end of the book there is an appendix with these. In his foreword Mr. Hughes says: 'It occurred to the writer that, if its unknown or lesser known stories of romance and adventure can be rediscovered, children may be persuaded to search the Old Testament with deeper interest and pleasure, and perhaps find help for their own lives in the records of those failures and successes of long ago.'

This is a book which can be put to all sorts of uses, and no one who has anything to do with children will regret getting a copy.

The building of a church, however interesting to the parties concerned in it, is not a subject about which one would care to write a book. Yet here it has been done, and well done. The title is *The Story of St. Mildred's, Addiscombe,* by the Rev. Charles W. Budden, M.D., and Mr. R. R. Hutchinson (Clayton; 2s. 6d. net). The achievement here recorded is certainly a notable one—a church costing £40,000, built, and nearly cleared of debt in six years, and its vicar takes a very pardonable pride in telling the story. He has done more than that, however, for the first part of the book is given to recording the history and legends connected with St. Mildred to whose memory the church is dedicated. The story of the building of the church is a fine stimulus to faith. 'The phrase that faith can remove mountains has become proverbial, and yet only a few believe it. . . . Just as when Nehemiah began to restore the walls of Jerusalem and rebuild the Temple there were many who scoffed and sneered, "The thing can't be done," so it was with us. But the congregation, filled with the Spirit of God, removed the mountains of prejudice and stupidity, of selfishness and ignorance, and they conquered.' The book is adorned by an uncommonly fine coloured photo of the interior of the church.

A nativity play, *Gold and Frankincense*, has been written by Mr. Richard Whitwell (C. W. Daniel; 1s. 6d. net). It is difficult to assess its value without knowing whether it is meant to be performed by or for children or adults. If by the former, some parts seem unsuitable. If by the latter, criticism will be less unsympathetic. In any case, it is worth looking at. Permission to perform it may be had from the publishers at a moderate fee.

Recent years have witnessed a revival of interest in the textual criticism of the Old Testament, and there is a growing feeling that a new systematic and scientific method must be developed for handling the text. A study of the Kethib-Qere—*The Biblical Text in the Making* (Dropsie College, Philadelphia; $2.50)—by an American Jew is, therefore, very welcome. Dr. Robert Gordis, the author of this monograph, finds that there are two stages in the use of the Qere. In the first the aim is to guide the reader and to warn him against blasphemy, coarse language, or incorrect pronunciation; in the second we have records of alternative readings. Dr. Gordis accepts the normal view that the Hebrew text, as we now have it, is based on a single approved MS. He believes, however, that variations still persisted, though few of them made a real difference to the meaning of the text, and that some of these were perpetuated in the Qere. He has cited and classified the 1350 instances of Kethib-Qere which he finds in the Bible, and has argued his position with skill and force. In placing the choice of the standard archetype before A.D. 70, he seems to be going beyond his evidence; the facts are capable of a different interpretation, and two or three books were not fully recognized as canonical till after this date. But this is a minor detail which does not impair the validity of the main thesis; his patient and exhaustive work should be of great value in helping to establish the earlier forms of the text. Occasionally there are misprints, especially in the omission of Daghesh Forte with the Article.

China is in the news daily and will probably continue to be so for a long time to come. To any one wishing to widen his knowledge of that great country and the leading personalities in it we can cordially recommend *China Faces the Storm*, by Mr. Ronald Rees (Edinburgh House Press; 2s. net). It deals in the main with Protestant

Missions and the Christian Church in China, but it will surprise many to learn how big a share in the Chinese Government is taken by the leaders of the Christian Church. We get here many vivid impressions of Chiang Kai-shek and the remarkable family of the Soongs to which his wife belongs, of the Christian General Feng, and other distinguished figures. The part which the Church is playing in the development of the new China is sketched in an interesting way in a book which is packed with information.

A very beautiful book on the way of prayer is *A Man Praying*, by Mr. J. H. Bodgener, M.A. (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net). To say that it is beautiful, however, is to do it much less than justice. It is intensely practical. The writer is convinced that a 'quiet time' in which we are absorbed in our own state is apt to become morbid. And, moreover, in such circumstances we often mistake our subconscious thought for the will of God. The cure for such errors is adoration, the turning from self to the great Objective Reality. Still further, he believes that people need guidance as to the *how* of prayer. It is as wise to tell people to pray as it would be to tell one who had never learned the piano to play one of Mendelssohn's *Lieder*. He therefore offers the help that the common man needs by suggesting a way of adoration through mental images. His book is of great value because of its combination of devout feeling with keen perception of realities and shrewd common sense. It is not often we find a book on prayer so objective and inspiring.

One of the main difficulties with which a research student is faced is due to the scattering of important contributions to his subject among a large number of different periodicals and miscellaneous volumes. His first task is to discover what has been done and where it is to be found, and anything which will save him a part of this labour is to be heartily welcomed. In the sphere of Jewish studies, a most useful piece of work has been done by Mr. Jacob R. Marcus and Mr. Albert T. Bilgray, in the publication of an *Index to Jewish Festschriften* (Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati). Fifty-three of these complimentary volumes are treated, and there are some four thousand entries, arranged under Author, Title, and Subject. The whole has been typed and duplicated, and, for those who can obtain copies, it should prove a valuable help in the study of Judaica, including the Old Testament.

The Rev. John Maillard is known to many for his work of spiritual healing at Milton Abbey and in missions throughout the country. The story of that he has written in 'Healing in the Name of Jesus.' He has now published *Disciples of Jesus* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net), in which he commends the gospel upon which his work of healing is based. Elements in his teaching may seem somewhat precarious, as where he declares that bodily healing should be prayed for without the qualification, 'if it be Thy will,' or again where he urges that, when after prayer there is no evidence of healing, the patient should still go on believing that he is healed, in the sense that a long process of healing is going on within him in accordance with the text 'first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear.' These, however, are but small items in a book of very fine Christian teaching, written with great simplicity and persuasiveness, a book full of ardent devotion to Christ and belief in the power of prayer, a book that will stimulate to faith and hope and love.

It Began in Galilee, by the Rev. Reginald J. Barker (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net), is designated in the subtitle, 'A study in revolutionary Christianity.' The writer is concerned chiefly with emphasizing the social implications of the Christian faith. To this end he reviews the ministry and teaching of Jesus, dealing with such topics as His relation to the family, to women and children, to the rich and poor, to civil rulers and foreigners. All this is done with much ability and passionate earnestness, although at times with a manifest bias of judgment and a lack of sympathetic understanding of the position of those from whom the writer differs. There is evidence of wide reading throughout, and the wealth of illustration lends colour to the book. In conclusion, the writer rather vaguely indicates that 'our greatest need is some new movement which stands for the whole revolutionary outlook and experience of real Christianity.'

A book which we would warmly commend for reading during Lent is *The Yoke of Christ*, by the Rev. H. G. G. Herklots, M.A., Rector of Flixton, Manchester (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net). There is an introduction by the Bishop of Manchester who tells us among other things that Mr. Herklots is a member of the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement, 'the contribution of which to the life and thought of the Church I believe in these days to be of special value.' The subject of the volume is discipline and freedom, and the keynote may be found in the second study. We have given part of that as the sermon in The Christian Year for the fourth Sunday in Lent.

Clearness of thought and beauty of expression are always to be found in any book by Miss Evelyn Underhill, and this little manual of devotion—*The Mystery of Sacrifice* (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net)—is no exception. It is a meditation upon the Eucharistic Liturgy, following mainly the order of the Anglican Prayer Book, but supplemented by references to, and extracts from, other Forms of Service, especially of the Eastern Church. The organic character of the Liturgy is emphasized, and although the various phases—the Preparation, the Oblation, the Intercession, the Consecration, and the Communion—are treated of successively, the unity of the whole is never lost sight of. The chapter on Intercession is particularly impressive, if, indeed, any distinctions are possible in a book which is uniformly beautiful and uplifting. Miss Underhill's name is specially associated with the exposition of Mysticism in its purest form, but she is no believer in any kind of Mysticism which leaves behind the sense-world, and 'the whole rich tangle of creation, loved and supported by God.' She is strongly opposed to any division in thought or religious practice between personal devotion and the service of humanity. 'The Eucharistic life is not a devotional addition to existence, but the clue to all real existence whether social or personal.' She urges also that there should be no abrupt division between the preparatory Eucharistic adoration of God and the act of Communion. This, in her view, goes far to ruin the essential Christian synthesis: 'it is only those who have accepted the long, exacting discipline of preparation, who have offered themselves in oblation, given themselves to intercession, and finally surrendered all to the triune consecrating power, who can enter into the depth and fullness of that mysterious Communion in which man feeds upon the self-given Divine Life.'

It would be difficult to find a book more valuable than this as a devotional preparation for Holy Communion.

The Bishop of London's series of Lenten books has now reached its fifteenth year, and the issue of each new volume is an annual event eagerly anticipated by many. The little volume for this year has been written by Bishop Horace Crotty, D.D., who, after twenty-seven years of service in Australia, is now Vicar of St. Pancras. Its title is *The Church Victorious* (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net), and as the Bishop of London remarks in his Introduction, 'it is an encouraging and hopeful book. There is so much pessimism about in the world, even in the Church, to-day, that it is a great help to read such a book.' The writer has very fresh and decided views upon many subjects connected with the Church's life and work. His message will stimulate thought and stir to action. It combines in a rare degree and with a fine balance the spirit of private devotion and the spirit of public service.

There are so many books on ethics, both popular and academic, that a new one would seem to need some justification. *New Morals for Old*, by the Rev. V. A. Holmes-Gore, M.A. (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net), justifies itself by its subtitle, 'Being an Attempt to Restate and Defend the Christian Ideal of Marriage.' Does it need to be defended? If the answer is that it is being attacked on all sides, and most fervently in current fiction, it might be sufficient to say that the attack on Christian marriage follows inevitably the decay of Christian faith. Christian belief is the only sanction of Christian morality. All the same, a restatement of the Christian moral ideal is not quite superfluous, and this the writer supplies in his opening chapters. There is a certain lack of coherence in the argument, but on the whole the book is a useful one.

Teachers in both day and Sunday schools will be grateful to Miss Ethel L. Smither for her book, *The Use of the Bible with Children* (Methodist Book Concern, New York; 75 cents). She is an experienced teacher and knows her subject. In successive chapters of a general character she lays down some principles for the teacher's guidance, and then proceeds to the use of the Bible in each grade from the nursery school onwards. There is a wealth of wisdom and knowledge in these pages, drawn from the stores of the writer's own experiments, and the book may be commended to all who are engaged in the religious training of the young.

We have received a copy of the twenty-third annual Hale Memorial Sermon, published by the Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Illinois. It is entitled *The 'Western' Text of the Gospels* (50 c.), and is from the pen of that able and industrious New Testament scholar, the Rev. William Henry Paine Hatch, Ph.D., D.D., D.Theol., Professor in the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Dr. Hatch upholds Professor J. H. Ropes' views of the 'Western' text as 'a definite integral text' and a revision of a previously existing text. Dr. Ropes limited his study of the 'Western Text' almost exclusively to the Acts, and Dr. Hatch here asks, Does the 'Western' text have the same characteristics in the Gospel that it has in the Acts? The answer is in the affirmative; for Dr. Hatch finds in the 'Western' text of the Gospels addition, omission, substitution, and improvement. Which all goes to support Westcott and Hort's general judgment that 'the chief and most constant characteristic of the "Western" readings is a love of paraphrase.'

The importance of the Oxford Conference on Church, Community, and State has been recognized throughout the Christian world, but many have not found it possible to follow its discussions and read its reports in full. A brief and popular account of its work and findings is therefore very welcome. This is now given in a little but valuable book, *That They Go Forward*, by Mr. Eric Fenn (S.C.M.; 2s. net). The writer was the assistant general secretary of the Conference, and he writes with full knowledge and in a style which is very readable. He deals with such topics as the disunity within the Church, the influence of economic questions, the conflict of loyalties to Christ and Cæsar, and the problem of international disorder. All are competently handled, and the book is emphatically one which should be put into the hands especially of the young that it may germinate and fructify in their minds.

The Thirlwall Prize Essay for 1937 was awarded to Mr. T. Lyon, B.A., and he has published it under the title, *The Theory of Religious Liberty in England, 1603–39* (Cambridge University Press; 7s. 6d. net). The subject has indeed been treated recently, but there is ample room for this well-informed and scholarly treatment. Throughout the seventeenth century the subject of toleration was frequently discussed, but practice lagged behind theory. We find here the various attitudes and views taken by the persecuting Anglicans, the Puritans, the separated Churches, the Anglican Latitudinarian Divines, the Latitudinarian Laymen, and the Roman Catholics. Then, in a chapter on the theory and practice of toleration, Mr. Lyon gives food for thought. It is an important topic which, as we see under our eyes, may easily attain very practical importance, and a perusal of the history of the birth-struggles of toleration in England has more than academic interest.

The lack of a convenient edition of the Scots Confession has long been felt, and we rejoice that that can no longer be subject of complaint. A handy edition has been issued by the Church of Scotland Publications Committee—*Scots Confession, 1560, and Negative Confession, 1581* (2s. net). It is edited by Professor G. D. Henderson, D.Litt., D.D., of Aberdeen, whose learned but interesting Introduction is very informative. Appended to the Scots Confession is the 'Negative Confession' of 1581. We hope that not only students of Scottish Church History but a much wider public will avail themselves of this most interesting publication. Only one point, we think, needs revision. On page 83, 'we now in the time of the Evangell have twa chiefe Sacraments' seems to be a mistake as the Latin version makes plain; *nos duo quidem sacramenta, eaque sola agnoscimus . . . fatemur.*

◆

The Place of the Sermon in Worship.

By the Reverend H. F. Lovell Cocks, M.A., B.D., Principal of the Scottish Congregational College, Edinburgh.

'I go to church to worship God, not to listen to a man's opinions on the events of the day. As far as I am concerned, the sermon is more often a hindrance than a help to worship.' The lifelong and zealous Congregationalist who takes this view is by no means alone in his depreciatory judgment of the sermon. There is widespead dissatisfaction with our Protestant diets of worship, and every part of the service is being critically scrutinized. The sermon does not escape. Modern man, being psychologically rather than theologically minded, cannot understand why the Reformers regarded preaching as the central act of worship. Good preaching, he admits, will always have its place as an *aid* to worship; but in what sense can a human word addressed to man be itself worship offered to God? Is it not rather one among other means of creating an atmosphere of worship, having no other title to precedence than that conferred by Protestant tradition? Why should it be taken for granted that preaching is the primary function of the minister? Are we not loading our ministers with a burden which only exceptionally gifted men can carry? Let the Protestant churches make use of their boasted freedom and call to their aid every means whereby the sense of God may be aroused in human souls. Let there be less preaching and extempore prayer and more liturgy, music, and symbolism. Let it be recognized that the first task of the minister is not to preach sermons but to lead the congregation in the worship of God. If he has an oratorical gift, his preaching will enrich the service; if not, it is more than likely to be an intolerable intrusion. It is well that he should be a trained theologian and a competent philosopher, but whatever else he may or may not be, he must be a psychologist. He must know how to create a devotional atmosphere and focus the God-consciousness of the congregation.

It is all to the good that the sermon is no longer taken for granted. That preaching should be the central act of Christian worship is no self-evident truth, but a paradox of the most startling kind. Yet so long as we remain at the psychological point of view, we shall never understand the real nature of preaching and worship. The psychologists can help us to find answers to many important questions concerning the details of worship and sermon-making, but they cannot tell us what worship and preaching really are. The belief that they can answer these questions also rests upon presuppositions which have nothing to do with psychology as such, but belong to a philosophy of religion. As a scientific observer, the psychologist cannot be expected to discern the critical difference between Christian faith and everything else that is called worship, but it is a philosophical prejudgment that decrees that his verdict be accepted as the last word on the subject, and goes on to reject the findings of a Freud or a Leuba in favour of those of a Pratt or a Thouless. What is this prejudgment? Simply that the Christian revelation, though the highest and purest among revelations, is not in essence different from the rest; that it is the most perfect flowering of man's religiousness rather than the unique incarnation of the Word of God. Once this is accepted, the place of preaching in worship is easily determined. The sermon is merely a means of stimulating and guiding man's natural religious impulses. It ranks with liturgies, incense, anthems, and Gothic vaulting as an instrument for awakening a slumbering consciousness of the divine. In this context neither preaching nor worship means anything remotely resembling what the New Testament and the Reformers understand by the term. Thouless, for example, says [1] that 'in worship in its simplest form we have a group of persons trying to get into relationship with God.' But from the standpoint of Christian faith, the attempt 'to get into relationship with God,' so far from being the simplest form of worship, is much more likely to be the subtlest form of original sin. And when Pratt says [2] that the sermon is Protestantism's 'great weapon . . . in liberalizing and deepening religious thought and in directing the forces of the Christian community toward purity of private life and toward aggressive actions in the great struggle for social righteousness,' he is describing almost everything the sermon may be except that one thing that makes this frail human reed the two-edged sword of the living God.

I

Worship is essentially the normal human response to the self-revealing God; for man is man only as a *responsible* being. This does not mean that worship is natural to him. Between the normal and the natural lies the Fall. What is natural to man as we know him is not worship but idolatry. Yet even this travesty, like the hypocrisy that is the homage vice pays to virtue, is man's unwitting recognition of the absolute claim of his Creator. Thus the presupposition of worship is revelation; there can be no worship of an unknown God. Christian worship is response to the revelation in Jesus Christ, a communion with God mediated by the incarnate Word. The response is unique, like the Word that calls it forth—it is *faith.* Now faith is not merely 'the cognitive element in religious experience,' or a belief in God which is no more than the foundation of worship. It is not a first tentative contact with God, destined to give place to a fuller communion with Him as the soul grows in sanctification. From first to last, and throughout its earthly range, Christian worship *is* faith and nothing but faith. And similarly, that righteous loving obedience which is the only true worship of the Holy God is not something added to faith—as though we might believe in God without surrendering to Him. Once more, faith is not a precondition; faith *is* righteousness.

---

[1] *Introduction to the Psychology of Religion*, 159.

[2] *The Religious Consciousness*, 303.

As faith, Christian worship is conformed to the Word that creates it. The gospel is not only true but new. It is no timeless truth which reason discovers, but tidings of a miracle of grace which only faith can receive. That the Word is incarnate, that it is historical revelation, means that its content is not detachable from its form, the way it comes to us. The gospel is not the occasion of our bethinking ourselves of a truth we already know, nor is it the spur to our natural religiousness. Our response to it is *toto cœlo* different from an assent to the self-evident or a reaction to a psychological stimulus. We cannot believe in *this* God without acknowledging ourselves to be guilty sinners. Our worship is a miracle—a communion of sinners with God. Here alone belief in God *is* worship and not merely its cognitive presupposition. Here alone belief is accounted unto us for righteousness.

Preaching is the act whereby the Church bears witness to the Word. 'Preaching,' says Forsyth,[1] 'is the most distinctive institution of Christianity.' It is the typical faith-act. It is not primarily instruction, though it may instruct us; nor exhortation, though it may edify us; but proclamation of the Word. The Church's teaching ministry is not central but ancillary to what is central, her proclamation. As for exhortation, men who hear in faith what God has done for man do not need our little ethical essays. The moral imperative of Christianity strikes home in its grand indicative, its proclamation of the mighty acts of the redeeming God. Instruction, edification, and the rallying of men to noble purposes, are features of religious oratory in general. What is distinctive of Christian preaching is precisely its character as proclamation. It is her preaching that distinguishes the Church from all other societies for human betterment. Her philanthropic ministries and social reform movements can be paralleled outside her borders, but not her preaching of the Word. Here she acts in her unique character as the fellowship of witness. Whoever would understand what the Church is must look first at this fact—that she is commissioned to preach.

Because preaching is primarily proclamation, and only incidentally exhortation and instruction, the preacher is not to be confused with the orator. Even where the two dwell together in one person, it is the preacher who must dominate the partnership or the Church will suffer. Like any art, oratory may be a divine vocation, but even so it is not the same vocation as preaching. The orator is an artist, an individualist expressing truth through the medium of personality, but, even more, personality through the medium of truth. Not so the preacher, who stands in his pulpit as the spokesman of the Church's witness to the Word. He is not there to exploit an artistic gift but to discharge an Apostolic commission. He is not there to express his own opinions, however original and striking, or to lay bare his own soul with a poetic abandon. He preaches from a personal experience of grace, but it is the Word and not his own experience that he preaches. His commission is not to discourse at large on life and religion, or even to create an atmosphere of worship, but to proclaim the good news of salvation. Let him but succeed in this, and the atmosphere of worship will need little attention from the psychologists. He is called to be, not a striking figure and a magnetic personality, but a nameless man, a voice. Preaching is the act of the fellowship, and the preacher is the sacramental man through whom the great Church bears witness to the gospel.

II

It is because Christian proclamation is conformed to the Word it proclaims that it is sacramental and not merely symbolic. A symbol is the vehicle of an idea or an experience. The words of great poetry are

> magic casements, opening on the foam
> Of perilous seas, in faery lands forlorn.

In their more pedestrian prose use, words convey ideas from mind to mind. Yet are 'vehicle' and 'convey' the right terms? The symbol is a stimulus or an occasion rather than a medium. It brings no 'good news'; it only reminds us of what we already know. It can speak to us only in so far as it speaks from us. It can strike the chords of the soul and awaken the overtones of feeling, but it cannot renew our lyre or teach us the music of the spheres. It is a gateway into the realm of contemplation and æsthetic experience where we find a brief respite from the pressure of actuality. Since the symbol is only a reminder, the form it takes is unimportant. The soul can take a hint from almost anything.

The sacrament, on the other hand, is not a hint but an event, bringing not merely illumination but a summons to decision. Because it must testify to the divine deed of grace, its form is unalterably fixed; it can never be anything other than an act of obedience and trust, the act of faith. The words of the sermon are not themselves the sacrament, but, like the bread and wine of the Holy Table, only 'elements,' symbols through which faith bears witness to the Word. Without symbols faith would be dumb. But the Word faith proclaims brings the very symbols into conformity with itself. Thus the language of faith is a reorientated symbolism, no longer pointing us away from the empirical world to timeless truth and 'eternal values,' but leading us by the opposite road, out of our æsthetic moods and non-committal contemplations, out of our 'living, and partly living,' into the full concreteness of our historical existence. Only God can transform our human speech into the event of His coming, but, as expectation of the event, preaching is a sacramental act which testifies that the Church remembers that the Word has been spoken and dares to hope that through her proclamation it will be heard again. She points back to a historical revelation, and forwards to a kingdom that is to come. As historical and eschatological sacrament, the preaching of Christian faith bears witness to the absolute truth that *becomes*, to the incarnate Word.

---

[1] *Positive Preaching and Modern Mind*, 3.

The sermon thus stands at the centre of Christian worship, between the Scripture and the sacramental ordinances and in organic relation to both. Christian preaching is rooted in Biblical testimony. Now we do not make our sermons Biblical by merely 'taking a text.' A passage from the Bible that is no more than the motto or literary frontispiece of a discourse essentially unrelated to it is a mere form, a convention better abolished. If we want mottoes for our addresses, why should we take them exclusively from the Bible? Why not from Confucius or Wordsworth? The Biblical text need not come at the beginning of the sermon, but at whatever point it enters it must come not as an apt quotation but as the pivot, the point of reference of the whole. Biblical preaching means first and foremost expository preaching, yet it is something more than exposition. Scripture and sermon are not related as divine text and human commentary, but as historic and contemporary witnesses to the gospel. Exegesis and elucidation of the Biblical text are the foundation of preaching but not its superstructure. The gospel is not hidden in the Bible like a mineral in a mountain, and preaching is more than quarrying blocks of truths. The Bible has its unique place in our preaching, not because it is identical with the Word—the Word is not a book—nor because of its transcendent qualities as literature or as a 'human document' of religious experience, but by reason of its character as the classic witness to Christ. The task of the preacher is not only to let its evidence be heard, but to make it intelligible to modern man—which, of course, is not the same thing as to make it acceptable to him. But the Biblical witness must be shown to be relevant, and the preacher is the *pontifex* who builds the bridge between the Bible and the contemporary situation. The distinction between *Biblical* and *topical* preaching ought to be no more than the distinction between one end of the bridge and the other. True preaching is always Biblical and topical at the same time. It is topical, because it speaks to a man where it finds him, making contact with him through the book he is reading or the experience through which he is passing. It is Biblical, because it brings him a message which, as Kierkegaard said, makes the news of the day the beginning of eternity—a message not to be found in best-sellers, psychology, or current events, but only in the Bible. Or—ought we not to say?—*through* the Bible. For the Word is no antique truth which the scholar laboriously deciphers. The witness, indeed, is ancient and its evidence needs interpretation, but the Word is a living Word which God will speak to us here and now, a Christ who becomes our contemporary. 'Say not in thy heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down): or, Who shall descend into the abyss? (that is, to bring Christ up from the dead). But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith which we preach.'

Baptism and the Lord's Supper are not mere adjuncts to preaching. Still less are they to be prized above it as belonging to the Holy of holies, while preaching is relegated to the outer courts of the sanctuary. In the Sacraments the Word is made visible. Here are acted sermons whose naked simplicity is a sign that our faith stands not in the wisdom of men but in the power of God. Here the preaching of faith rises to a climax beyond the highest flight of human eloquence, but it is preaching still. The sacramental ordinances do not supply a grace lacking in preaching as such. They are seals ratifying the intention of faith to proclaim no human opinion or surmise but the Word and promises of the God of truth.

III

Preaching thus stands at the focus of worship. The service of prayer and praise is dominated by the proclamation. We pray for many things, but above all, that God will presently speak to us. We thank Him for all the blessings of this life, but chiefly for this, that we have heard His gospel of mercy and deliverance. We confess our sin and unworthiness, but only as we confess the grace and glory of His Son. The psychological unity of the service will be best secured by a more careful attention to its evangelical unity, in which the sermon with its Biblical and contemporary witness to the Word is not just an item but the organizing principle. All this is true, however, only if the sermon is genuine proclamation; for there is preaching and preaching.

'There you are,' say the critics. 'Does all this hair-splitting come to anything more than this—that good preaching is an aid to worship, while incompetent and uninspired preaching is a hindrance? What you have done is to vindicate the right of the good sermon to a place in the service, which did not need doing. What you set out to do, however, was to establish the centrality of preaching as such, and this you have not done. The efficacy of the sermon depends upon the sort of preaching it is.' Now of course there are good and bad sermons. Good sermons are those which make the Biblical witness living and relevant. Bad sermons are those which, through the dullness or incompetence of the preacher, fail to do this. But is this difference between good and bad sermons—which nobody will dispute—at all to the point here? The question surely is not whether a bad sermon is proclamation in spite of its badness, but whether a good one is proclamation because of its goodness. Can our finest oratory, Biblical study, psychological knowledge, and religious earnestness secure that the message we preach shall be no merely human utterance but the divine Word? The answer is that they cannot. Here the paradox of preaching unfolds itself in its most uncompromising form. When we are commissioned to preach we are commanded to do what can never be done by men. Therefore, whenever human preaching becomes proclamation of the Word a miracle has happened, the true transubstantiation, whereby a human word, not distinguishable as to its accidents from any other human utterance, is transformed as to its substance into the authentic gospel. To preach and hear the Word of God does not stand in our power as sinful men. It happens *ubi et quando visum est Deo*. The Holy Spirit is the only preacher.

But what of our human preaching? Have we not in a single sentence disqualified it as worship and annulled its sacramental claim? Why try to preach if all our trying will not make us preachers of the Word? May not our silence before God be our most eloquent proclamation and our highest adoration? The answer is, first, that the Church has received a divine commandment to preach. What, then, can her preaching be? Not, as a human enterprise, proclamation of the Word. Yet it presupposes the Word and bears witness to it. The Church knows that 'Christ died to save sinners' is only a bare formula until each sinner hears it in his own language as 'Christ died for *me*.' She knows that the Word of God is not bound, and that it may find utterance through other voices than hers and in other places than within her fellowship of witness. But she also knows that it is *this* Word, 'Christ died for sinners,' this and no other that she must proclaim, and that in *this* place she is to await the Spirit's visitation. To feed the hungering multitudes she brings her five loaves and two fishes—a veritable foolishness, but it is all she can do, and it is commanded. But the foolishness of preaching is conformed by the wisdom of God to the foolishness of the thing preached, the Word made flesh. Preaching, not the Mass, is the true sacrament of the Incarnation. Obedience here is beyond the power of an enthusiastic idealism which will not believe that anything is impossible. Nothing will serve but a clear-eyed realism, which, beyond the limit of every human possibility, dares to hope with no ground for hoping save that God has spoken His Word of promise. Nothing but faith will serve—but is faith a human possibility? No, faith also is the gift of God. To the pilgrim Church faith is not given as an abiding possession. The Church does not live in faith as in a native element of serene assurance, nor is the Word given over into her keeping or put at her disposal. Nevertheless, faith is her life. She lives from the faith that is memory by the faith that is hope. Her proclamation is a waiting upon God in prayer and thanksgiving, an eager expectancy, a listening. Can there be given to God a greater glory and a purer adoration than when men thus take Him at His word? God grant unto us, His Church, to offer this worship to His Holy Name.

Old Texts in Modern Translations.

Philippians iv. 6, 7 (Moffatt).

By the Reverend James S. Stewart, B.D., Edinburgh.

'Never be anxious, but always make your requests known to God in prayer and supplication with thanksgiving; so shall God's peace, that surpasses all our dreams, keep guard over your hearts and minds in Christ Jesus.' 'Never be anxious,' says St. Paul. An easy thing to say: a terribly difficult thing to practise! If this is to be made the test of our personal Christianity, how many of us will come through with flying colours? ''Tis not dying for a faith is so hard,' says one of Thackeray's characters in *Esmond*, 'man in every age has done that; 'tis the living up to it that is difficult, as I know to my cost.' So when Paul comes to us, amid all the rush and fever and fret and difficulty and distraction of our common days, and bids us 'never be anxious,' we feel inclined to say, 'Come down to earth! Who can live up to that?'

What scores of familiar anxieties get woven into the pattern of life! Here is a business man, worried almost to breaking-point by the uncertainty of the future. Here is a parent, troubled and perplexed by the differences in outlook between one generation and another. Here is a home where some one is lying ill. Here is a man who has been out of work for years, and is feeling now that he is not wanted, and is no use at all to any one. Here is another who is half-killed with overwork. Here is a girl who has set her heart on some fine and noble vocation out in the world, but she is needed at home, and the door of opportunity seems closed. Here is a young fellow with high ideals, and he is beginning to realize how much moral compromise the world tolerates and even demands, and how difficult it is going to be to keep his ideals untarnished. Here is a student at the University worrying about a career. Here is a soul tasting the full bitterness of being lonely. Here is another facing a difficult task with limited resources. Here is one afraid of death. Here is another even more afraid of life. There seems no end to the anxieties that are woven, as by the hand of fate, into the texture of life's pattern.

Yet here is Paul calmly advising us, 'Never be anxious!' I think our first instinctive reaction would be to say: 'This man does not know what he is talking about! If he can't say something more helpful than that, he might at least hold his peace and not mock us!'

Perhaps some of those Philippians, whom Paul is here addressing, may have felt like that. For it needed strong nerves—to live the Christian life in Philippi. It was like living on the edge of a volcano. Persecution was in the air. The atmosphere was tense with hostility. At any moment, subterranean forces might flare up overwhelmingly. Yet here is Paul saying, 'Never be anxious,' and apparently expecting them to take him at his word, and to rise to it. What an optimist! What a mocker!

Yes, it would have been mockery, *if the man had stopped there.* That is where Stoicism puts the full stop. When Stoicism has said a thing like that, it has no more that it can say. 'Keep calm. Be brave. Be passionless. Never be anxious.' And that is all. Not a word more. But where the Stoic ends, Jesus Christ begins. There is no full stop there in Christianity. The Christian gospel runs right on. 'Never be anxious, *but*'—and then comes the secret of the defeat of anxiety, then comes the method by which the victory that seemed impossible is put within our grasp, then comes the strategy of the saints—'but always, in everything, make your requests known to God in prayer and supplication with thanksgiving.' That is the authentic Apostolic way with every trouble, every worry in the world. *Bring God into it.* Get the horizons of the divine around it. Undergird it with the love of Heaven.

Note Paul's language. Note that significant 'always,' 'in everything.' Has it ever come home to you with the force of a personal discovery that you can talk to God about absolutely anything—anything whatever that is burdening your secret soul—that that, indeed, is what God wants, not stereotyped prayers, daily following a beaten track, nor vague generalities skimming the surface of the real difficulty or problem, but your most intimate confidences about everything? There is an Old Testament historian who tells how once Hezekiah the king received a disturbing letter from one of Sennacherib's envoys. It was the kind of letter to send a man off his sleep for nights. But Hezekiah, says the narrative, having read it, 'went up into the house of the Lord, and spread the letter before the Lord.' And whatever the invading anxiety is, you can always do that with it. It is a marvellously healing thing, to take God into your confidence about everything.

But look at Paul's strategy again. 'Prayer and supplication *with thanksgiving*'—that, standing as it does in a message about worry, is mightily significant. When you are feeling fretted and unhappy, says Paul in effect, when life is doing its level best to thwart your plans and defeat your hopes, pause and remember the lovely things on the other side, all God's troops of stars amid the darkness. Turn over the page to the credit side of the account. Do you mean to tell me, asks the Apostle, that that side is a blank? Or that there are only one or two trivial entries there that really don't count at all? Look again! Why, even when life is at its worst, that credit side is loaded and packed full with mercies. 'Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all His benefits!' Forget not you are His debtor for every breath you draw; His debtor for life and intellect, and memory and hope, and the courage to endure; His debtor for day and night, and the wind on the heath, and the light of sunset skies; His debtor for every moment of insight, every clasp of the hand of a friend, every atom of beauty in the world around you, every experience of forgiveness at the foot of the cross of Jesus. Be sure to see to it, says Paul, that you face your difficulties and frustrations in the light of your mercies and blessings, 'in prayer and supplication *with thanksgiving*.'

And all the saints are with him there. There was a brave servant of Christ of a former generation, Allan Gardiner of Patagonia. His life as a missionary was a record of terrible sufferings and privations; and he was found at last lying dead on the shore beside an upturned boat. And there, where it had fallen from his hands, was his diary, telling of the hardships he had been through—the hunger and the thirst, the wounds and loneliness. But the last sentence, some words pencilled scarce legibly before the dying hand could write no longer, was this: 'I am overwhelmed with a sense of the goodness of God.' Everything was lost—home, love, and human fellowship, and now life itself was going: and yet, on the very edge of the last silence—'overwhelmed with the goodness of God!' And will we say we have nothing to thank God for? Take life even at its most hurting and most difficult: have we no cause for praise? 'Always,' says Paul, 'in prayer and supplication *with thanksgiving*.'

Now I think we can see just how the release from anxiety is achieved. It comes along three lines.

First, *prayer sets things in true perspective.* We are too near our own problems to estimate them correctly. Just as an artist, working on some wide canvas, has to stand back now and again and view it from a distance, so you and I, if we are to keep our proportions right, have to stand back occasionally from the noise and bustle of life, stand back into that healing silence which is the presence of the eternal God. 'At last,' cried an old saint in an hour of victory, 'at last I have made firm my staggering soul!' That is what prayer does—steadies the jaded nerves, lifts the fevered spirit into a calmer, ampler air, makes a blessed silence in the din of all life's conflict, and makes you sure (as nothing else can do) that the eternal God—who is the deep, central peace of the universe—is your refuge, and that underneath are the everlasting arms. So prayer makes firm the staggering soul. It sets things in their true perspective.

Breathe through the heats of our desire
  Thy coolness and Thy balm;
Let sense be dumb, let flesh retire;
Speak through the earthquake, wind, and fire,
  O still small voice of calm!

Secondly, prayer achieves release from anxiety *by bringing our will into line with God's will.* Am I misreading the situation when I say that a major cause of the restless, unsatisfied feeling and of the frictions that spoil the soul's serenity is simply this—that our will and God's will are speaking with different voices? God's will says, 'Do this'; and our personal inclinations say, 'No—do that!' And, of course, that means dispeace and civil war within. But what happens in prayer is this—that we take our life, and deliberately put it under God's command. We say 'No' to self, and 'Yes' to God. In our own degree we do what Jesus did that dark night in the garden, when again and again He prayed the quiet, deliberate words, 'Not what I will, but what Thou wilt.' To do that may mean some kind of Gethsemane for us, as it meant for Him; but on the further side of such praying I think we shall always find—what Jesus found—a wonderful sense of release and liberation, and a serenity which the world is powerless to destroy.

In the third place, prayer achieves release from anxiety, not only by putting things in true perspective, not only by bringing our will into line with God's will, but also *by liberating within us new resources of power for handling the difficult business of living.* Life is not easy to manage, and I dare say we have all had days when we have felt hopelessly inadequate for the task; and it is a nervy, anxious business confronting difficult situations with deficient interior reserves. At such times life is apt (as we say) to 'get on top of us'; and—like Isaiah, crying, 'Woe is me, for I am undone'—we feel tragically ineffective and futile. But what happens when you pray—if it is true prayer—is this, that you are connecting yourself up with an unseen environment charged with creative power; and down that connecting-line of prayer the infinite energies and resources of that unseen world come flowing, and are released into your own life: so that now—again like Isaiah—you can confront the hardest task, the most difficult situation, not indeed with a sense of self-sufficiency, but with a grateful knowledge of God's adequacy, and can say, 'Here am I: send me!'

Lord, what a change within us one short hour
  Spent in Thy presence will avail to make!
  What heavy burdens from our bosoms take;
What parched grounds refresh, as with a shower! . . .
Why, therefore, should we do ourselves this wrong,
Or others, that we are not always strong;
That we are ever overborne with care;
  That we should ever weak or heartless be,
Anxious or troubled, when with us is prayer,
  And joy and strength and courage are with Thee?

Now look how Paul goes on. 'So shall God's peace keep guard over heart and mind.' What a lovely phrase it is—God's peace! It means the very peace that dwells in the heart of God Himself. Nothing less than that is the promise. And, says Paul, it shall 'stand as sentry' to your soul. The word he used was military; and it must have had a special force for his readers. For Philippi was a Roman colony, and there was a garrison in occupation; and these people had watched many a time the Roman soldiers mounting guard, and the sentinels patrolling the gates. That, says the Apostle, with his vivid imagination, is what the peace of God will do for you, once you really possess it in your heart. It will guard the gates. It will hold the fort against every threatening intruder.

If you accept that picture, then inner peace is a very different thing from what many people imagine. It does not mean escaping the battle. It does not mean a comfortable lotus-land to dwell in. It does not mean 'O for the wings of a dove, for then would I fly away and be at rest!' It does not mean that the Christian, any more than any one else, is promised exemption from the troubles and difficulties and disappointments of life. It does not mean that. It certainly did not mean that for Paul, with his floggings and stonings and shipwrecks and imprisonments, and the daily care of all those worrying churches. It did not mean that for Jesus, despised and rejected and cut off from the land of the living. No, not for a moment does it mean that in return for our prayers or piety God is going to deal out preferential treatment, or give us an easy passage through the troubles and tangles of life. But it does mean this far more glorious thing—that when troubles come, as come they must, the central citadel of your soul shall stand inviolate, for God Himself will garrison it, and God's peace guard the door.

Such is the victory of the God-centred life, and such its strong, ineffable serenity. It 'passeth all understanding,' says Paul; it 'surpasses all our dreams.' You may have seen it, he means, on the face of a friend who has found it; you may have watched its transforming influence at work in one life here and another there; but you cannot realize its power or blessedness until you have it for your own possession. It surpasses all our dreams.

Have we reached that stage yet, I wonder? I dare say there are a good many of us who would have to say that we have had hours when the peace of God was a reality, and then we have lost it again. Perhaps for days or months on end we possessed it: and then, disappointingly, it vanished from our grasp. Well, even our defeats can be of value, even our breakdowns of serenity can teach us something. This vital lesson they can teach us—that the peace of God is not something to be captured once and for all: it is something you have to recapture all over again every day. It is not achieved by one big, spectacular resolution. It is achieved by a daily re-surrender of your life to God. It is achieved by beginning every day, in the morning, with a new grip of the only Hand that can keep you safe.

And that is why Paul closes with the words 'in Christ Jesus'—'the peace of God shall guard heart and mind *in Jesus*.' That is the ultimate secret—not fine resolutions, but contact with a dynamic, radiant Personality; not laborious efforts at self-improvement, but the transfiguring influence of a friendship with the noblest, strongest, most understanding Friend in all the world. If only we would start each day with Jesus, if only we would reach out every morning to clasp the hand of our Friend, the ever-old, ever-new miracle would happen once again, and our restless hearts find rest at last in the invincible peace of God.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By the Reverend J. W. Jack, D.D., Glenfarg, Perthshire.

Cuneiform tablets, throwing a welcome light on historical conditions in the second and third milleniums B.C., are now being discovered in large numbers in Mesopotamia and Syria. The recent expedition to the Habur region, under Mr. M. E. L. Mallowan, has brought to light a Record Office at Chagar Bazar, containing seventy tablets, carefully stacked on flat trays of pottery, and inscribed with over 2200 lines of script. They date from 1900–1700 B.C., and so far as deciphered at present appear to be accounts recording the receipt of wheat and barley from numerous farmers. At Brak, which lies about twenty-five miles south-east, Mr. Mallowan has discovered a vast Sumerian palace, erected about 2300 B.C., having a ground plan one hundred and sixty yards in length, and with a long range of dwelling-houses abutting on one end. In one of the houses was a private chapel, with a decorated semicircular clay altar in the corner. In the front face of the altar, in one of the middle panels, there was a small hole penetrating right through the altar into a secret chamber at the back. The purpose of the opening seems clear: it must have served as an oracle hole or speaking-tube, through which a priest in concealment behind could make his pronouncements. In the aperture was found a gold finger-ring—perhaps the price of some consultation. There is no evidence that the Israelites, even in the primitive stage of their history, ever resorted to deceptive divination of this nature. But the statement that Rachel 'went off to consult Yahweh' (Gn 25^{22}) certainly suggests an oracle of some kind, and an interpreter like the Arab *kāhin*, as also does the same expression in Ex 33^{7} and elsewhere. Similarly, the early laws ordaining that certain cases were to be brought before God for decision (*e.g.* Ex 21^{6} $22^{8\text{f.}}$, etc.) imply an oracle, or at least a priest at a sanctuary to pronounce God's will. We read also of a 'terebinth of the oracle-giver' (Gn 12^{6}, translated 'oak of Moreh' in A.V.), where God is said to have spoken to Abram, and a 'terebinth of the soothsayers' (Jg 9^{37}, translated 'the plain of Meonenim' in A.V.). With the gradual rise of true religion in Israel under the teaching of the prophets, such early modes of seeking to discover God's will were slowly abandoned, and in course of time were forbidden (cf. Mic 3^{5-11}).

In a previous article (Dec. 1936) we referred to the official correspondence of the Assyrian kings during the Sargonic period (722–625 B.C.), consisting of 1471 tablets in cuneiform preserved in the British Museum. The publication of these by Professor Leroy Watermann has now been completed and gives us much valuable information bearing on the Old Testament. With very few exceptions, they were discovered at Nineveh, having been sent there from various parts of the Assyrian empire and even far beyond it. The writer has gone through the whole of the correspondence, and would draw attention to the light which the Letters throw on the Biblical record:

No. 48: The author of this letter says, 'I lift up my hand (to God),' and in No. 370 prayer is called the 'lifting up of our hands.' Cf. Abram, Gn 14^{22}; also Dn 12^{7}, Rev 10^{5}.

No. 65: From the word used ('*adri*'), we find that the portion of the temple which constituted the private apartment of the god was a dark chamber (from the Assyrian word '*adâru*'=' to be dark'). This reminds us of the unlighted room which constituted the 'oracle' in Solomon's Temple (1 K $6^{19.\,20}$ 8^{12}). The private chambers of the gods in Egyptian temples were similar.

No. 67: We read here (also in 119 and 706) of a revolt in '*Ebir-Nâri*, which is equivalent to '*Eber-hannāhār* ('Beyond the river') in the Bible (cf. Jos 24^{2}, 'Your fathers dwelt in 'Eber-hannāhār in old time'; also Neh $2^{7.\,9}$, Ezr 4–7). At first the expression signified the land immediately west of the Euphrates, but by the time of the tablets it had come to include also Syria and Palestine.

No. 108: Here an officer, *Rab-mugi*, is mentioned (also in 154, 843, 1217, 1343). He is to be identified, no doubt, with 'Rab-mag' of the Old Testament (cf. Jer $39^{3.\,13}$), and appears to have been an official with a variety of activities, though his specific functions are not clear.

No. 186: We read of 'mothers who pour out libations to Enlil.' (Cf. Jer 44^{16-19}.) This letter seems to imply that certain murderers were arrested in spite of the fact that they had taken refuge in the temple, and it thus illustrates 1 K 2^{28-34}.

No. 220: The name Sarai ('*Sarâi*') occurs as the author of this communication (to the scribe of the palace): 'Your handmaid Sarai.' Hence, considering the date of the Letters, it can hardly be an earlier form of 'Sarah,' as some scholars have supposed (cf. Gn 17^{15}). The fact is that the termination *-ai* is an ancient Aramaic or Syrian feminine (found also in Arabic and some cognate languages), while *-a(h)* is the equivalent Hebrew one.

No. 255: Ḫammurabi (the king) is twice mentioned here as *Ammurapi*, which appears to have been the Assyrian pronunciation of the name, the former being the Amorite. This leads to the identification of Ḫammurabi with Amraphel of Gn 14^{1}, for *bi*=*pil* or '*phel*' in the cuneiform.

No. 286: The name *Mardukâ* occurs (also in 1456). Cf. Mordecai (Ezr 2^{2}, etc.).

No. 353: Here we find the title *Rab-shaki* (also in 1451), proving the existence of an official with this designation, and hence confirming 2 K 18^{17}, etc. His office was probably of a diplomatic and military nature.

No. 404: Here 'eyestones' or 'stones with eyes' are mentioned (cf. Zec 3^{9}).

No. 599: The name *Abirâme* occurs as that of a singer in Urzuhina. It is found in the Old Testament (cf. Nu $16^{1.12}$, 1 K 16^{34}, etc.), and corresponds to the Biblical Abrām. In the other form, 'Abraham,' the *h* appears to have developed from the long vowel *ā*.

No. 632: Mention is made of tribute from Judah (probably during Manasseh's reign), of which the Book of Kings (2 K 21) and the Book of Chronicles (2 Ch 33) give no hint.

No. 633: Here we read of *Halbishu*, 'the Samaritan,' who lived in Gozan (cf. 2 K 17^{6}), and of other individuals bearing Israelite names (*Paltiah* and *Neriah*, which have Yahweh terminations). In No. 1009 we have also mention made of Samaritans (*Samirnai*) serving in the Assyrian army. The reference in these cases must be to the members of the Israelitish captivity of 722 B.C. (2 K 17^{6}). In No. 1201 we read of tribute grain received from the Samaritans, but here the correspondent evidently means the mixed population settled in Samaria after the deportation (2 K 17^{24}).

No. 771: Here we find the words 'the plant of life he (the king) has put to our nostrils.' Cf. Ezk 8^{17}, a text hitherto obscure.

No. 1041: This letter speaks of messengers sent to Judah (*Bit-Iaudi*, 'House of Judah'). The reference may be to the incident in Is 39, where we read of Merodach-baladan sending a message to King Hezekiah.

The whole of the tablets bear eloquent witness to a far-seeing systematic effort to keep cities, provinces, and even the remotest outposts in vital touch with the capital. As most of them called for replies, thousands of important texts must still be buried in the rubbish heaps of ancient Assyria.

The excavations at Lachish (now under the control of Mr. Lankester Harding since the lamented death of Mr. J. L. Starkey) have shown that the city experienced a widespread conflagration in the latter part of the thirteenth century B.C. This conclusion is evident from the large amount of ashes and burnt remains in this layer, combined with the fact that many pieces of imported Mycenæan vases and Ægean incised ware, as well as a scarab of Rameses II. (1301–1234 B.C.), were found there. It seems possible to reach a more precise date for the conflagration from the bowl (in twenty-five fragments, now put together), the discovery of which we mentioned in a previous article, and which is inscribed on both sides in Egyptian hieratics. The text is very imperfect, but relates to deliveries of wheat, evidently for tax purposes, and bears three dates all in the fourth year of some Pharaoh. As the fragments were found in the burnt layer, the conflagration must have taken place that year or shortly after. It is clear that the Pharaoh in question could not be Rameses II. (for, as Albright has pointed out, the city was certainly not destroyed at the beginning of this monarch's reign of sixty-seven years), but must be one of his successors. All the facts seem to point to his immediate successor, Merenptah (1234–1224 B.C.). According to this Pharaoh's triumph stele, he invaded Palestine in his fourth or fifth year (1230 or 1229 B.C.), when he 'destroyed Israel,' took Gezer and other cities, and reduced 'Kharu' (*i.e.* the southern parts) to submission. Was the destruction of Lachish at this time due to his campaign? We know that Gezer and Lachish were closely associated in government as well as in art and culture, and the devastation of the former would naturally involve the latter. At all events, Lachish was in Kharu, and would probably be included in the invasion. It is not unlikely, indeed, that the destruction of other cities also (cf. Debir, *e.g.*), which seems to have occurred towards the end of the thirteenth century, was the result of this Pharaoh's ruthless campaign. According to some archæologists, it was caused by the Israelite entry or Conquest, which they are inclined to place at this later date on the ground that such cities show no material traces of Israelite settlement earlier than this. But if there be no such recognizable traces before Merenptah's time—and this, to say the least, is very doubtful—due regard must be had to the slow process of assimilation that went on. The Israelites, who had only been used to a nomadic or pastoral existence, could not adopt city life or ways within a single generation, but, like all desert tribes under similar circumstances, required one or two centuries to make any effective settlement in the land, especially in some centres where Canaanite or Egyptian influences were strong. This is evident from the pottery alone, which did not assume a distinctively

Hebrew type until the time of David and Solomon. Moreover, Merenptah's invasion was no mere idle boast. As early as his third year, we find (according to Papyrus Anastasi III.) a well, a fortress, and a city in Palestine all named after him; and that the subjugation of Gezer must have caused him considerable trouble, and perhaps a siege, is apparent from his subsequent title, 'The Binder of Gezer.' No record of his campaign, it is true, remains in the Biblical record, but it must be remembered that there is no mention there of other historical events, even greater, such as the invasion of Palestine by the 'Sea Peoples,' the occupation of the Shephelah by the Philistines, or the burning of Gezer in Solomon's time.

The excavations which were begun over a year ago by Mr. P. L. O. Guy at *Tell Kudadi*, near the mouth of the Auja or Yarkon river, two or three miles north of Jaffa, are being continued by Dr. E. L. Sukenik, of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem. The *tell* measures some fifty by twenty-five metres, is about nine metres high, and at the present day has on it a lighthouse and a small war memorial. 'It is the most interesting small site I have visited,' says Mr. Guy. The opening-up of it may add an important contribution to Old Testament study, for not only did the boundary of the tribe of Dan pass near here (Jos 19[46]), but it was probably to this very spot that the wood for the building of the First and Second Temples was brought from Tyre and Sidon (cf. 1 K 5[9], Ezr 3[7]). The neighbouring haven of Joppa was a dangerous one owing to low sunken rocks, and it was often impossible to approach it, whereas here floats were able to come with ease close up to the bank. The remains of a building, evidently a fortress, containing a number of rooms, have been unearthed. The walls, which were of dressed sandstone, still stand about four and a half metres high, and appear to have been surmounted by a tower. According to the potsherds, the structure dates from about 1000 B.C. As there are walls running in various directions, showing different types of masonry, as well as indications of two conflagrations, the place must have undergone successive changes in the course of time. Further reports will no doubt give us more definite information.

Dr. Nelson Glueck, who has been making explorations recently in the land of Ammon, has been able to fix the northern boundary of the Nabatæan kingdom. Judging from the sherds found on the surface, he is of opinion that a line drawn from about the north end of the Dead Sea, and running east through Mâdebâ to the desert, would mark the boundary here. North of this lay the Ammonite kingdom, whose territory was one of the richest in Transjordan. Here he has examined many of the strongly built circular towers or fortresses, with which the land is dotted. These towers have immense walls composed of great flint blocks, and some of them adjoin rectangular structures built in the same massive style. At some places there are several of these complexes grouped together, but there does not seem to have been any outer city-wall surrounding any of the groups, nor are such walls to be found on most of the Ammonite sites. In the past, investigators have assigned these buildings variously to the Megalithic, late Neolithic, Chalcolithic, and Early Bronze periods, but Dr. Glueck, on the basis of the pottery found, places their erection in the Early Iron Age (1200–1100 B.C.), and regards the Ammonite civilization at this period as an advanced one, with a flourishing state and an intensive system of agriculture. Probably Dr. Glueck's dating will not be considered as final by all archæologists, seeing that more than surface exploration is required to reach certainty. Many sherds get removed in course of time, others are buried deep, others are worn to dust through centuries of ploughing, while all traces of others are cleared away by successive building on the same sites.

Large numbers of 'toggle-pins' (so-called) have been dug up in the course of time in Palestine and neighbouring regions. These are long thick pins (made of bronze, bone, silver, gold, or other material), having a round hole through them some distance from the top or even quite near the middle. Though not mentioned in the Bible, such pins must have been common among the early Hebrews. Recently Mr. E. Henschel-Simon has made researches into the use and origin of them. He comes to the conclusion that they were not hairpins, as some archæologists suggest, but that with a few exceptions—such as the Mesopotamian ones, which were possibly used as a kind of stiletto—they were intended for fastening garments. A string was kept tied to the hole, and after insertion of the pin through both edges of the garment, the string was wound several times round the two projecting ends, so as to keep the pin in position. The earliest specimens, he finds, come from Mesopotamia (Ur and Kish) as early as *c.* 3400–3100 B.C. Considerable numbers, dating about five hundred years later, have been found in northern Mesopotamia, especially at Tepe Gawra and Tepe Giyan, and others of still later time in Palestine and various countries surrounding the Mediterranean. All the pre-Hyksos types (two of which have been found at Megiddo) form a more or less homogeneous group, and appear to have had a common origin, no doubt Mesopotamian (Tepe Gawra), with possibly one centre of manufacture, though some specimens in the foundation deposit at Byblos are probably of Caucasian origin. A new wave of toggle-pins appeared in Palestine with the Hyksos. During this period they were a popular object of daily use, but the Hyksos type seems to have had no immediate connexion with the Mesopotamian, but may have had a Caucasian origin. After the expulsion of the Hyksos from Palestine, these pierced pins lived on, though reduced in numbers, and by the time of the Early Iron Age they had disappeared and become replaced by the fibula.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

A Wise Wish.

By the Reverend Chas. M. Hepburn, B.D.,
Moulin, Pitlochry.

'And God said, Ask what I shall give thee.'—1 K 3^5.

Not long ago, as no doubt you know, there was a wedding, a royal wedding, between King Farouk of Egypt and the lady who is now Queen Farida. Farida was not her former name, but one specially chosen for her by her husband. It is said to mean 'the unique one.' So it was quite a natural name to choose, since any man who loves his wife thinks there is no one quite like her in all the world. Farouk's own name, however, has a meaning too, 'the one who distinguishes between right and wrong.' A fitting name for a king indeed, for it is a king's duty to try to do right and avoid wrong.

It reminds us exactly, does it not, of another king, one of the wisest kings of all time. I mean Solomon. One night Solomon had a dream, and he dreamt that God said, 'Ask what I shall give thee.' And what did he ask? What would we have asked? Riches, and honour, and high position? Or long life, perhaps? No, Solomon asked none of these things. 'Give thy servant,' he said, 'an understanding heart to judge thy people, that I may discern between good and bad: for who is able to judge this thy so great people?' A great wish, wasn't it? And God gave him his wish. And Solomon became a very wise ruler, distinguishing between right and wrong. Also as a result his country flourished in his reign.

Now, that power of judging aright is one of the best gifts a person could have, especially one who has much authority and may need to make important decisions. It is said that the late Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Davidson, prayed in this wise for his successor, Dr. Lang, 'O Lord, give thy servant judgment.' It was a good prayer. I think his prayer has been answered, and that his successor has been able to decide with wisdom in many complex and difficult things.

In our own smaller affairs as well, that is a gift that we all need. In order to keep to the straight path and to do what is right, we must know what is right or wrong. But God has given us that power without our asking. He has put a still, small voice within us, which we call Conscience. I am sure we can catch it whispering sometimes, 'This is right,' or 'That is wrong.' Of course we must not regard our conscience as one boy did. Asked what conscience was, he replied, naming a friend of his, 'Conscience is a wee thing inside me what tells me when Willie Smith's done wrong.' A very convenient sort of conscience no doubt. Ah, but our conscience isn't meant to be the traffic-controller for Willie Smith, it's the traffic-controller for ourselves, to warn us when we may go wrong.

And, remember, there is always One who is even surer than our own Conscience, Some One who was sent by God to be the Conscience of the world. Sometimes we may be a little uncertain about our own conscience. It may not be speaking very clearly. So what can we do? Here is what we *should* do, check our conscience by His. Ask what He would say, or what He would do. So we shall not distinguish wrongly. Because the Lord Jesus Himself is The Truth. Anything He ever said, and anything He ever did, couldn't be wrong. You remember, for instance, how He once said, 'Ye have heard that it hath been said, thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy: but *I say* unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you.'

And our hearts tell us that He is right, for forgiveness is right and revenge is wrong. So when we are in any doubt whatever, we can confidently turn to Him, because He can distinguish perfectly between right and wrong.

H.M.V.—A Record of Your Own.

By the Reverend A. Beaghen, East Molesey, Surrey.

'This is the record.'—1 Jn 5^{11}.

There is a new sort of automatic machine in big Stores and on the Pier at the seaside that you talk into and get a record of your voice and what you said. You first put in your sixpence and then your voice. You talk into it for three minutes and a record comes out at the other end which you can take home. You can get your little talk ready before you go into the box or you can just chatter anything you like or you can say your favourite piece of poetry. Or you could speak a message to Mummy or Daddy or some one far away. You can take your record and put it on the gramophone at home, and you could speak to yourself, or you could send the record to Uncle Bill in Canada and say 'Thank you' for the present he sent you last birthday. There was quite a small crowd waiting to make records when I went to make mine. It was great fun putting it on the gramophone when I got home and asking the children to listen. It sounded a bit cracky and weak, but it was me speaking right enough. I think it is a great invention! But suppose we had a record taken of everything we said. We should hold back a bit when we were asked a straight question we didn't want to answer, about the bat we picked up that wasn't ours and which had got itself broken somehow, and which we had put away in a quiet spot where it wouldn't be discovered. We should have something to keep us quieter when we wanted to make a big noise about the way we were being treated, and how unfair it was!

Isn't it true that we are making a record all the time, not only by the words that come trooping from our lips but by the things we do and the way we do them. We are making a record that will be heard one day, believe me! It should make us feel that we ought to be watching very carefully what is going on it. There is a record we make when we do our work at school and at home. Some boys and girls don't like work. It's a fact! They get into the habit of thinking that work is what everybody tries to dodge if they can, and the result is they find lessons terribly hard and irksome. A good prayer when you get up in the morning is, 'Dear God and Father help me to love my work to-day.' Try it and see what a difference it makes. Then there is the record you are making by the way you do things. There is the nice way of doing what you are told and there is the other way. You know, when Mummy calls, 'Come along, time for bed,' she loves to hear a voice say cheerfully, 'Yes, Mum,' and to hear a couple of small feet begin to move AT ONCE. The 'other way' is the growly way: 'Wait a minute,' 'Can't come now,' 'O bother' way; and the record it makes is a scratchy, unmusical one that nobody wants to hear. Oh yes, we are making a record! And I wonder whether you have ever realized that we make a record when we speak to God in our prayers. God wants to hear our voices, singing to Him as the birds sing to Him, and speaking to Him when we pray together at school or in church or when we talk to Him alone. A little girl wrote to her Mummy the other day from school and told her she spoke to God each day when they had a quiet time: and she said she had told another little girl about 'talking to God,' asking for His help when lessons were hard or when she felt unhappy. You can see how lovely a record like that must be.

And we might turn the record round because on the other side God has made a record for us to listen to. His Voice is Jesus speaking to us and telling us that God, His Father and ours, is Love, and that He wants all the world to come to Him for forgiveness and help. You can hear His voice speaking to you any time you like, and happy the boy or girl who has said, 'Lord Jesus, I am listening; I am coming to You to be Yours for ever.' It is when you do that that you don't find it hard to be kind and unselfish and gentle and loving. His joy finds its way into your voice too. The old grumble goes away and the new note of 'Thank you for everything' comes in. I am told that blind people listen for 'the smile in the voice' since they cannot see it. Jesus puts the smile in your voice because He puts joy in your heart. There is no need then to be afraid of the record. It will be H.M.V. recording!

The Christian Year.

Second Sunday in Lent.

Guerdon of Faith.

'For indeed we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened.'—2 Co 5^4 (R.V.).

A man may groan and yet be blessed. 'We are of good courage,' St. Paul says a little later. He does not say, 'We shall be of good courage.' He says it without an If or a But, as he has previously simply said, 'We groan.' A man can have good confidence only at a time and in a place where he groans. In the shadows of a great darkness, in the immediate presence of sad and dreary situations where anxiety closes our eyes and ties our hands, precisely there a man may have hope and be of good courage.

Paul is saying something even more remarkable in our text. He says that if we know the real reason for our groaning, we may be of good courage, even while we are groaning.

He mentions first a mistaken diagnosis of the cause of our groaning. We see, he is saying, that our whole so-called life, with everything that belongs to it, even the things that are great and important and dear to us, is like a tabernacle. It is being erected only to be taken down sooner or later. It is like a hut, as Luther has translated it. It denotes transitoriness. There is a beautiful poem by Johann Peter Hebel on *Transitoriness* in which he says: 'Whatever comes, comes young and gay,' but all glides silently toward old age and finds an end. There is no standing still. Do you not hear the brook's unceasing chatter? Will not the stars forever twinkle through the nights? It seems that nothing moves, and yet all things do move and pass away.

We are afraid of life's breakdown. For even if it is only a tabernacle, it is in many respects a comfortable dwelling-place. Even if there is much to life which is not desirable, we are afraid of the hand which threatens it and which points out to us that we have here no abiding city. We feel almost like a man who is being robbed of his garments in the cold of winter. Here a piece is taken and there another of the things we admire and love. Nothing is left except a Nay.

May not our silent and audible groaning and all our problems and laments be reduced to this one cause, that we are disquieted by this large Nay which rules our life? We have seen the truth of our life, in one way or another, and its truth is death. And now Paul makes a very bold assertion. He tells us: You are groaning, and think you know its cause. But you do not know it. You are mistaken about yourself. You must learn to know yourself. Yes, indeed, the meaning of what you call life is death. But the meaning of death is true life. You are wanting this true life; you are in search of it. You have lost it; but you have not forgotten it. It escapes you; and still you are aware that it exists. You are putting forth much effort in this and that and the other things; but you want the true life. It is within you although you are not one with it.

Here is the cause of our groaning. The real source of our problems and groans is not the transitoriness of our life; their reason is the fact that it has not yet appeared what we shall be.

Yes, the way to life leads through death; not only through what we call death—finally also this, to be sure—but through an extended cancellation, removal, limitation, and discarding of what we call life. True life begins where everything ends. It is not death that is painful, but that we do not yet live.

Yes, life is a play in which we score no abiding values. But are we not hard pressed by our insight that we are only playing at life? Would we not take pleasure in this play, if we were not aware of something else? For a time we may enjoy playing at merchant, and minister, and doctor, church, school, and state, or being genteel and educated. But the cause of our pain is our knowledge that something should be happening and that there ought to be some real accomplishment totally distinct from the best that we can do, and in fact do, even in our best efforts. The cause of our anxiety is not the Nay but the Yea which has been pronounced over us, even before the Nay has come over us. Why is it that we do not surrender our life in a dull and stupid resignation to this Nay and Nothing? We cannot do it because we know the Yea to be the first and original word of our life; and now that we know it, now that it has come over us as the final and abiding fact of our life, we must suffer from it. See, here is the cause of our groaning, Paul is saying: 'We long to be clothed upon with our habitation which is from heaven.'

God has begun to trouble us with an anxious restlessness. Paul himself says: 'Now he that has wrought us for this very thing is God, who gave unto us the earnest of the Spirit.' Here indeed is the Spirit—our indissoluble communion with God; our unquenchable remembrance of eternal life; our uncancelled expectancy of it; its creative power; and because we have them, therefore we groan while we are in our tabernacle, Paul is saying.

If we have heard and understood this, then we can perhaps understand a little more. Paul is saying: Because it is God who has wrought us for this that we must groan in this present life, therefore our groaning is not done without good confidence. For the man who understands himself and therefore knows also that God is the cause of his groaning, has gained an insight which will make him confident in his greatest and deepest sorrow. He sees death in the light of life. He understands the necessity of death, and transitoriness, and Nay. Their purpose is to make room for life. As they do their appointed work, true life is drawing nigh; and we come near our goal of being clothed upon without habitation which is from heaven. The mortal must be swallowed up of immortality; and it is being swallowed up; and to this end that which is mortal must die.

Who among us knows this also? We have a bare inkling of it; and therefore we have difficulty in grasping what Paul has told us. And we can grasp it still less that he was really and truly confident in a world where we cannot be confident; that he did not become a hermit with his insights; that he did not lock himself up with a few chosen disciples; that he did not rest, but lived, and fought, and suffered, and fell, and rose again, and triumphed with these insights, and filled the world, this dreary world of death with his victorious deeds, and set it in motion to God's glory.

Such confidence transcends our horizon. Once again we may see what Christ, Christ crucified, meant to Paul. He testifies to have seen in Him the crisis of the times; a thrust through the most fearful Nay to a most glorious Yea; the closing of a so-called life in death and the appearance of true life from beyond death; he saw every little light extinguished and a new large light rise out of the darkness. He saw men without God; and then he saw God as He is turning to men: God with us, Immanuel. From this vantage-point Paul looked at life. He saw why we groan. He saw the building from God. He saw that the tabernacle must be taken down. He understood that he must be well pleased with what made him also shudder most. He groaned; and yet he was of good courage. He had a vision of the Resurrection.[1]

THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT.

St. Peter's Memories of Holy Week and Eastertide.

BY THE REV. ARTHUR KING, M.A., THE PARSONAGE, THURCROFT.

1 P 5^{5}, 4^{7}, 3^{9}, 2^{21-25}, 5^{2}.

A striking fact about the Epistles of the New Testament is that in them we find very few references to the various events of our Lord's earthly ministry, or indeed, to the actual statements that He made. This is especially noticeable in the writings of St. Paul. But in the First Epistle of St. Peter there do seem to be a number of references to some of the actual happenings of Holy Week and of the great 'Forty Days' that followed, and it seems likely that as he drew together his material, St. Peter's mind consciously or unconsciously went back to five of the main scenes of Holy Week and Eastertide:

1. The Footwashing in the Upper Room.
2. The Garden of Gethsemane.
3. The Palace of Caiaphas.
4. The Cross of Calvary.
5. The Sea of Tiberias.

1. *The Footwashing in the Upper Room.* In 1 P 5^{5} (R.V.) there is the injunction, 'Yea, all of you *gird yourselves with humility*.' The verb that is used here in the original (ἐγκομβώσασθε) is an interesting one; for as Dr. A. J. Mason has pointed out: 'The substantive derived from the uncommon word not elsewhere found in Biblical Greek is said to have been the name given to a sort of apron or overall worn by slaves—perhaps for the protection of their clothing while at work.' One cannot but feel that as the Apostle was pleading with the converts of Asia Minor to put away their pride and daily to gird themselves with the garment of humility, his mind was going back to the night before the first Good Friday; when their Master and Lord had taken a towel and had girded Himself with it before He washed the feet of His disciples. St. Peter could not possibly forget that Maundy Thursday, for he had hesitated to allow his master to do so humble a task for him; and had received an answer that could not be forgotten—'What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt understand hereafter' (Jn 13^{7}). Surely it was with that picture in his mind of the Lord girded with the towel and engaged in doing the work of a slave that he pleaded with the converts of Asia Minor to 'gird' themselves with humility?

2. *The Garden of Gethsemane.* There is another of his exhortations in this Epistle that makes one feel that his mind was reverting to the events of Holy Week; and that occurs in 1 P 4^{7}, 'Be sober, and *watch unto prayer*.' It looks as if he was thinking of that dark hour in Gethsemane when the Lord had said to the three: 'Abide ye here, and watch,' and again to him personally, 'Simon, sleepest thou? Couldest thou not watch one hour? Watch and pray.' In Gethsemane he had failed; and soon afterwards, in the High Priest's Palace he failed

---

[1] K. Barth and E. Thurneysen, *Come Holy Spirit*, 268.

again in the presence of the servants on the household staff. It shows us that the shame caused by that failure in the Garden and in the Palace never left him, and was never concealed by him in later years. And those who know from their own bitter experience that failure to make time each day for private prayer and meditation results inevitably in failure in unexpected crises to bear the witness that they ought—they will be the first to understand why St. Peter twice in his short Epistle bids them keep their 'Quiet Times' each day, as he pleads with them to 'be sober and watch unto prayer' (1 P 4^7), and again, to 'be sober' and 'watchful' (1 P 5^8).

3. *The Palace of Caiaphas.* Another familiar charge in this Epistle is in 1 P 3^9: '*Not rendering evil for evil, or reviling for reviling*, but contrariwise blessing'; which reminds the reader of something that comes in the previous chapter, 'Who, when he was reviled, reviled not again' (1 P 2^{23}). Here once more, one feels that St. Peter's mind was back again in the scenes of Holy Week that were witnessed in the High Priest's Palace, for he 'had followed Him afar off, even within and was . . . warming himself in the light of the fire.' He could not forget that majestic silence that he had watched the Lord maintain when those false witnesses so cruelly distorted what He had actually said. 'Answerest thou nothing?' Caiaphas had asked in his bullying way; but Jesus 'held His peace, and answered nothing.' And His accusers knew as well as He that such perversions of the truth did not deserve an answer. And if, as is quite likely, this Epistle was written about the time that Nero was beginning to throw the blame of the burning of Rome upon the Christians as Tacitus says that he did, then we can readily imagine that elsewhere false accusations were already being made against the Christians in those anxious years. St. Peter wanted them to know how to control themselves when Nero's officers told their poisoned stories. He would have those early Christians do as their Lord had done in the Palace of Caiaphas. For He, 'when He was reviled, reviled not again'; and St. Peter's charge to them was not to render 'evil for evil, or reviling for reviling, but contrariwise, blessing.'

4. *The Cross of Calvary.* This Epistle, more perhaps than any other, bids Christians in affliction to remember and to draw strength from the fact that Christ their Lord has suffered as well (1 P 1^{11}, 3^{18}, 4^1, 4^{13}, 5^1). And so it was only natural that St. Peter's mind was constantly going back to Calvary. The passage that lays most emphasis on the Cross in this Epistle is 1 P 2^{21-25}. The striking feature about this passage is that in it St. Peter constantly speaks of Christ in terms of the 'Suffering Servant.'

v.^{22} 'Did no sin'; cf. Is 53^9, 'Had done no violence.'
v.^{23} 'Reviled not again'; cf. Is 53^7, 'Opened not his mouth.'
v.^{24} 'Bare our sins'; cf. Is 53^5, 'Bruised for our iniquities.'
v.^{24} 'By whose stripes ye were healed'; cf. Is 53^5, 'With his stripes we are healed.'
v.^{25} 'Astray like sheep'; cf. Is 53^6, 'Like sheep have gone astray.'

And from the speeches in the Acts we gather that it was a common habit of the early preachers of the Cross to assert that Christ was the true 'Suffering Servant' of God (the best example is in Ac 8^{26-40}). But this method of interpretation was not one that they had invented themselves. For on the final journey to Jerusalem our Lord had spoken of His Death as a 'ransom for *many*,' a phrase that seems to refer back to Is 53^{11}, 'justify *many*,' and Is 53^{12}, 'bare the sin of *many*.' And at the Institution of the Holy Communion the very same words from Is 53 appear to have been in the Lord's mind at the giving of the Cup. Also shortly after this the Lord is reported to have interpreted His Death in the language of Is 53^{12} ('And was numbered with the transgressors'). We may well believe that this habit that He had of interpreting His Death in terms of the language of Is 53 made a deep impression on St. Peter's mind. For when he preached about the Cross (cf. Ac $3^{13.\ 18.\ 26}$, R.V.), or when he wrote about it, he used the same method himself.

5. *The Sea of Tiberias.* But St. Peter did not only recall the lessons that he had learned in the Upper Room, the Garden of Gethsemane, the Palace of Caiaphas, and at the Cross of Calvary, for in 1 P 5^2 there are five very significant words of his: '*Tend* the flock of God.' Here, one feels, is a direct reminiscence, not of Holy Week, but of the great 'Forty Days' that followed the Resurrection of the Lord. '*Tend* the flock of God' writes the Apostle to the clergy of the scattered congregations in Asia Minor. His mind, surely, had gone back to that never-to-be-forgotten morning on the shore of the Sea of Tiberias, when the Risen Christ had prepared a meal for the hungry fishermen, and had spoken especially to Simon Peter. Three times the heart-searching question, 'Lovest thou me?' had been put; and three times there had been given to Simon the solemn charge—'Feed my lambs: *tend* my sheep: feed my sheep.' So the Risen 'Shepherd

and Bishop' (1 P 2^{25}) had spoken to St. Peter; and he could not forget.

Easter, amongst many other lessons that it contained, had always one of great significance for St. Peter; it spoke to him of Christ's way of forgiveness. Our way of forgiving others is often very cold and harsh: we are still, in far too many cases, like Parson Collins in *Pride and Prejudice,* who, in a letter about two young people who had acted foolishly, wrote: 'You ought certainly to forgive them, as a Christian, but never to admit them in your sight, or allow their names to be mentioned in your hearing.' But the forgiveness of the Risen Saviour is of quite a different kind. His forgiveness restores the penitent to the old relationships that had obtained before his fall. To him He says in words of grace that never fail to touch the hearts of men—'*Tend* my sheep; take up once more your work for Me.' No wonder that St. Peter, who had been so graciously forgiven and restored to active service in the fellowship of Christ's Church, handed on to others the same gracious words that the Risen Lord had spoken to him—'*Tend* the flock'; no wonder that he began his Epistle with that glorious burst of praise—'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, according to his great mercy hath begotten us again unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead' (1 P 1^{3}). So he passed on to others those memories of Holy Week and Eastertide that meant so much to him.

FOURTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Discipline of Freedom.

'Take my yoke upon you.'—Mt 11^{29}.

Religion of any kind involves the acceptance of a discipline, a restraint. Perhaps that is why there are so many people in the world to-day who will have nothing to do with religion at all. These are the people who go about demanding freedom from all the restrictions of the past. Why shouldn't we please ourselves? Why shouldn't we go in for the football pools, if we want to? It's no one's business but our own. This kind of plaint is still very often heard, but already it has a rather old-fashioned sound. To-day another note is being heard, and ever more loudly. There are now large numbers of people who, from the cumulative distresses of our time, have heard a new call to discipline. They have adopted an attitude that is essentially religious, though it is not usually Christian. They want to put themselves under orders and to be told what to do. They want to be privates in an army that is on the march.

In that march they find their freedom. In Germany, Italy, India, and Japan—to name but a few instances—nationalist leaders are offering men freedom through the service of their national ideals. Often, indeed, those ideals become almost personified into national gods. What says the Church to such things? It is the Christian criticism of all these movements that the only freedom they can offer is an imperfect one, because they are based upon the service of limited ideals and objectives. If freedom can only be achieved through service, we may well ask ourselves the question, 'Whose service *is* perfect freedom?' The familiarity of the words gives us the Christian answer. It is not enough to say, like Wilhelm Hauer, 'We belong to the number of those Germans to whom nothing is more sacred than the unity of Germany, and we are ready to sacrifice everything for it. But one thing we will not do: we will not betray the German genius, for we know that thereby we should betray the nation and the empire.' Nor is it enough to think, as perhaps we are tempted to do, 'Nothing is more sacred to us than the future of our families, of the children who give life its purpose and its joy.' No, there is One who is 'God and Father of all, who is above all and through all and in all.' From Him all fatherhood derives its nature and every nation receives its peculiar gift. His service *is* perfect freedom.

As William Law put it: 'If religion commands us to live wholly unto God, and do all to His glory, it is because every other way is living wholly against ourselves, and will end in our own shame and confusion of face.' It is only by the restraint of discipleship that we can come to the freedom of sons. It is only by the way of the Cross that we can come to the glorious liberty of the children of God. Viewed in this context, Christ's words have a deeper meaning: 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy and my burden is light.'

It is almost needless to say that these verses are of a type that is very often criticised by those who attack Christianity. Men say that it is obvious from such verses that religion is only a means of escaping from the hard facts of life into a world of dreams where wishes all come true.

The sentimental interpretation of Christianity is a wrong one. Christianity is not a cruise: it is a pilgrimage. The sentimental interpretation of these verses is also a wrong one. They do not call us to escape from life, but to face it; to face it in the right way. To bear a yoke is not to escape a burden. It is to learn to carry it properly. Any one who has been on a walking tour knows the difference in comfort between a cheap rucksack and one that is properly fitted with a frame, adjusted to the back and hips. With one, the contents may be quite light, but they are always rubbing one's back and making one hot between the shoulder-blades. With the other, the weight is properly distributed over the whole body; we can carry twice as much without feeling the strain. So it is with the yoke of Christ. It enables us to carry twice as big a burden and not to feel the strain. All men have burdens to bear. Some feel that they will carry theirs better with the yoke of Hitler or of Marx. But Christ says to us: Take My yoke; you will find that it fits easily: when you wear it, the big burdens seem light.

Christianity has this strength because it is a religion of the Incarnation, of God who made the world, and of God who is our Brother, who 'trod the path before us, and trod it perfectly to the end.' We have to face the difficulties of life. Jesus has faced them. We have to face the sorrows of life. Jesus faced them too: He was not ashamed to be seen weeping. We have to die. Jesus died too. Our God is One who was not afraid to be defeated, who was great enough to die. As Chesterton once finely put it: 'Christianity is the only religion on earth that has felt that omnipotence made God incomplete. Christianity alone has felt that God, to be wholly God, must have been a rebel as well as a king. Alone of all creeds, Christianity has added courage to the virtues of the Creator.' From Christ we can accept a yoke, because He wore one Himself.

This tremendous faith in the Incarnation is strong enough even to face the tremendous discoveries of modern science.

We approach God because He first approached us. He never sought to force man's allegiance. Man comes to Him as a captive, but it is always as a willing captive. He has been conquered, but it is by love. So God comes knocking at the door of the human heart. A baby was born in Bethlehem. A lad grew up in Nazareth. A wandering preacher collected a few fishermen friends. A criminal was executed outside Jerusalem. The One who knew no sin knew death, but death could not contain Him. His fishermen friends found Him beside them once again. Very soon they came to know that He did not wish only to be with them: He wanted to be with all men. For God willed all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth.

It is the Christian belief that in so simple a story God Almighty is in action.

When Christ speaks to us of ordinary things He knows what He is talking about. He came from an ordinary house. He had ordinary weak men as His disciples. He does not only tell us to wear a yoke: it is probable that He used to make them Himself. 'When God wished to redeem man, He did it from inside. Man himself fought and conquered.' The divine method is also the Christian method. If we wish to redeem a situation, we can never do it from outside, either by criticism or by good advice. We must do it from within.

As we wear Christ's yoke we know the guidance and the strength of His Spirit. The Paraclete was the Early Church's name for Him. It means, not primarily the Comforter, but one called to one's side to help, the great Ally. If we are truly Christians we learn each day the greatness of the task before us. We grow also in our realization of the power of evil. We know that evil is not to be explained away. But, more than that, we grow in the sense of the power of God. If we really take risks for Him, we really do find that He is at our side. But when we run away from the risk, we run away from God. Often, indeed, the taking of the risk may bring defeat. But in that defeat we may find victory of another kind if we find Him there. We have got to face difficulties and to carry burdens. But Jesus has faced them. Jesus has carried them. As life goes on, each year we have more to carry. But they do not seem more heavy, because we wear the yoke of Christ. Our Father knows the things of which we have need. Because He is the God of Jesus we know that we can trust Him entirely.[1]

PASSION SUNDAY.

The Sacrifice of the Cross.

'The Son of man came . . . to give his life a ransom for many.'—Mk 10[45].

Our Lord, having to some extent familiarized the minds of His disciples with the idea of taking up the Cross, an obligation which was imperative both for Him and them, pushed out a new and daring thought into territory unexplored. He began to hint at the unfathomed depths of experience which were waiting for Himself, and towards which they could follow Him only with a gradual understanding. 'The Son of man came . . . to give his life a ransom for many'—that was His unique and solitary calling. Yet it was based on an obligation shared by all the sons and servants of God—the taking up of the Cross, the law of spending and of serving, the adoption of the sacrificial principle as the dominant law of life. If the disciples adopted this as the motive of their own living, they might see more clearly something of what it involved for Him who, being the Master, was none the less but all the more the servant of all.

---

[1] H. G. G. Herklots, *The Yoke of Christ*, 25.

It is not turning aside from our theme if we consider something that went before the Cross and something that followed after it. There was something that went before the Cross—that strange, haunting prevalence of the sacrificial element in the religions of the world. The Jewish sacrificial system is the most familiar to our minds, but it is not there alone that we meet the sacrificial conception—the idea of man giving something to God, giving his best to God, giving his uttermost to God to counterbalance his faults and transgressions. Perhaps the earliest form of the sacrificial idea was that of a meal, at which the god and his worshippers met and in which he and they shared, being so at one: later, as human conscience developed, and a sense of sin deepened along with it, there supervened the idea of expiation, the thought of washing away sin by blood, of making up for failure and transgression by offerings heaped mountains high. But whatever views we may hold about the history of sacrifice, or the order in which the different aspects emerged, the prominence of the sacrificial element in ancient religion is undeniable: it is written in large letters and in many languages. Men were obeying one of the deepest instincts of their being when they felt they must lay something at the feet of God—it might be a simple offering like cakes or fruits, it might be a costly and painful sacrifice like the slaying of a beast or a man.

The amazing passage about the Suffering Servant in Isaiah enshrines a dream and a promise of something more truly sacrificial than any animal sacrifice, any material gift, could ever be—a sacrificial personality, a sacrificial life, from whose willing and unselfish offering the true deliverance might arise.

So long before Christ came, on many levels of attainment, sometimes crude and coarse, sometimes lofty and fine, the sacrificial principle burned and glowed in human religion. It did not come by accident. It had its meaning. It was waiting for its own completion in the fullness of the time.

We come to the hither side of the Cross, and enter the New Testament zone of experience. A strange thing has happened. The consciousness of reconciliation has swept in like a triumphant flood. There is nothing more suggestive to be discerned between the lines of the New Testament than the quiet dropping out and falling away of the old sacrificial system. Except in the Epistle to the Hebrews the matter is not even argued. God and man are at one: there is no need for any rudimentary or make-shift method of bringing them together. St. Peter tells men with profound simplicity: 'He suffered that he might bring us to God.' Paul proclaims through all the world the peace that is made through the blood of the Cross. The Church in the furnace, as we see her in the Book of Revelation, is conscious of nothing so much as of her own redemption: 'Thou hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation.' And St. John, looking beyond his own immediate environment, with that fine universalism which is so characteristic of him, exulting in the overflowing greatness of the grace which has appeared, proclaims One who is the propitiation, 'not for our sins only, but also for the sins of the whole world.' The point is that this unity of doctrine and testimony is rooted in a unity of experience. For believing souls the sky is clear and the conscience is at peace, and man has access to the very heart of God in full assurance of faith.

We reverently approach the Cross itself and ask what it means. It is very important in this realm to get at reality. It is not enough to be merely orthodox. But there is an illumined way. We recall those ancient sacrifices—men giving to God, giving their best to God. We recall how even then there were instincts that pointed farther—to a sacrificial life, offered not of compulsion but willingly, not in part but in whole. Then suddenly we come face to face with Christ, and it is as if the shadows departed and the reality were before our eyes. Here is the one life and death in which the sacrificial principle was fully accepted and embodied. We may not separate His life too much from His death: all through the long years of obedience He was giving Himself. We may not separate His death too much from His life: His death was the evening sacrifice of a day which had been sacrificial since its sunrise. That was what God received from Him: that was what He had come to offer on behalf of humanity—the perfect sacrifice, the spotless offering. And this old world which had so often groped after the right sacrifice and had so often found the wrong one, held up at last upon the dark, strange altar of Calvary her best treasure, her most perfect and costly oblation.

So we are back at the characteristic experience, at the endless doxology, of the redeemed. Goodness has suffered and they, the unworthy, profit. God gives and they accept. And knowing that they on their side have no worthy offering, they take the sacrifice of Christ and identify themselves with that, seeking never to untwine their grasp from the Cross till they have learned to die, to sin, and to rise into newness of life. Christina Rossetti in eight haunting lines has caught and fixed that moment of self-surrender:

Because Thy Love hath sought me,
  All mine is Thine and Thine is mine:
Because Thy Blood hath bought me,
  I will not be mine own but Thine.

I lift my heart to Thy Heart,
  Thy Heart sole resting-place for mine:
Shall Thy Heart crave for my heart,
  And shall not mine crave back for Thine?

This is Atonement not in name but in reality and in power. It is the beginning of that life of reconciliation in which God and His children walk together, nothing between.[1]

Palm Sunday.

Speculation or Service?

'Straightway one of them ran. . . . The rest said . . .'—Mt $27^{48f.}$.

'I thirst.' The Son of God is athirst! He confesses it aloud in agony. 'And straightway one of them ran, and took a sponge, and filled it with vinegar, and put it on a reed, and gave him to drink.' It must have been a relief even to a hardened executioner to be able at last to give rein to the dictate of compassion. The bystanders had just heard the most awful cry that has ever broken from the lips of tortured humanity, and they could do nothing. That was the cry of the human soul in the darkness of separation from its God: this cry betokens the reaction of the human body in its weakness. The darkness of mind is now passing away, the awful horror of sin has swept through the Saviour's soul; and as at the Temptation at the outset of His career, after the crisis was past, Jesus suffered hunger, so now at the end of it all He suffers thirst.

Two draughts were offered to our Lord upon the Cross. One was the cup of wine drugged with bitter herbs of narcotic tendency which was given in mercy to condemned malefactors to make them somewhat oblivious to their sufferings. This soporific our Lord refused, and it was to this high resolve to keep His faculties unclouded that we owe the Seven Last Words. The other draught which they offered to the Sufferer on the Cross was undrugged wine, the sour beverage which was the Roman soldier's daily ration. This our Lord accepted, as ever holding the mean between indulgence of the body and fanatical refusal. And by His acceptance of the offering of the nameless soldier who ran to His aid, our Lord has blessed all who have brought succour and relief to the wounded and stricken.

It is to the author of the Fourth Gospel that we owe the recording of these two tense words of pain, 'I thirst.' St. Matthew tells us that what stirred the unknown soldier into his deathless act of mercy was a cry whose import he could not understand. 'Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani?' How should a foreign soldier understand it? It was the mother-tongue in which Mary had taught her little lad, 'The Lord is my shepherd,' and the other psalms and prayers of childhood. Two instincts are uppermost in moments of physical agony and of mental anguish: the sense of the need of God which prompts to prayer, and the reversion to memories of childhood. Our Lord exemplified both these instincts as the end drew near upon the Cross. Just as some one who has been brought up in the mother-tongue in Wales or the Highlands of Scotland will revert to it in a moment of strain, so did Jesus from Nazareth cry in the old familiar speech to His Heavenly Father. And the heterogeneous mob round the Cross who had come up to Jerusalem for the Passover from many strange lands could not make out what the Sufferer was saying. 'Eli' sounded to them something like the name of the famous prophet, 'Elijah'; and some of them that stood by said, 'This man calleth Elijah.'

The cry for God from the human heart in its anguish and need has often been misunderstood by those who were not themselves in dire straits. They interpret it as a demand for some sort of human intervention—a prophet or a priest. To their ears this cry of the double thirst—of body and of soul—sounds like delirious raving. They can or will do nothing to slake that awful thirst. At the best, religion stirs in them an idle curiosity and speculation. 'Let be; let us see whether Elijah will come and save him.' 'Let be; let us see——' There speaks all the cynicism and indifference and stark incredulity of a Godless philosophy. That is all that it can say in the presence of the crucifixion of humanity. Stand aside, and see if some higher power will intervene! This policy of wait-and-see is fatal in the presence of the anguish of crucified humanity.

---

[1] J. M. E. Ross, *The Tree of Healing*, 83.

But there was one standing by who also heard the cry. To him it was as unintelligible as it was to the others. All that he heard was a cry—a misunderstood cry; but 'one of them ran.' This soldier understood as little as any of them what that awful cry meant. The bystanders were saying it was a prayer to Elijah; but he interpreted it as a call to himself. He did what he could even though he did not understand. He shared his ration of beverage with the Sufferer. And by his timely act he did something to roll away the cloud that lay upon the soul of Jesus. Caught in the agony and toils of suffering and sin, He looked up again into the face of His Father, and saw there something so strong and sure and steadfast, that to that safe keeping He could entrust His immortal soul. 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.'

There is something tremendously impressive about the simplicity, the anguish, the pathos of those words of helpless dependence, 'I thirst.' It is the undying cry of that humanity whose Representative hung upon that Cross, and it gives us the key to His Saviourhood. 'In all their affliction he was afflicted—*so* he was their Saviour.' And you may write books to prove that war is a 'great delusion,' as indeed it is; but almost before the book is reviewed the most devastating war in history may have broken out. The Cross in life is an ugly and painful fact, and men would gladly banish it if they could. But it stands eternally in our midst, set upon a hill so high that none miss it—the Cross of pain and suffering, of loss and sorrow and death.

'Out of the strong came forth sweetness'—but only when life had been yielded up. It is never to those who stand about the Cross, to the self-satisfied, or to those who have a comfortable and easy-going philosophy of life, or who think that there is nothing in human experience that needs explanation, that you naturally turn in time of need. 'Hath He marks to lead me to Him?' is the question which suffering humanity will instinctively ask when the darkness falls. St. Thomas had grounds for his conviction that he would never be quite sure that he had got a hold of his Saviour until he had fingered the wounds. The old nurse of Ulysses found the final proof of her dear master's identity when she discovered the remembered scar on his leg.

Those half-understood cries that break from the heart of suffering humanity, part physical pain, part mental anguish, what are we to make of them? Facing the cross of another's anguish there are the two attitudes. 'One of them ran. . . . The rest said.' Service or speculation? Duty or debate? His ignorance of all that awful cry betokened did not prevent one of them that stood by from running. 'This man called Elijah,' they were saying. 'Perhaps,' he said to himself as he ran; 'but I know that He needs me. I don't know who this Elijah may be, nor when he lived, nor whether there is the remotest possibility of his answering the cry, nor what he could do if he came. But I would rather go thirsty than not at least offer Him what I have.'

Recently I stood in the dark recesses of one of the caves in the Cheddar Gorge in Somerset, where prehistoric man had his dwelling. The light of day had never penetrated there. But they have introduced artificial light. And I noticed that in that dead and awesome cavern, here and there where the light was strong enough, there was a response of green and growing things—some hidden and chance-brought seed of fern or moss that was quick to obey the summons of the light.

'One of them ran . . . The rest said.' The world is full of those who say, 'Let be; let us see.' But it is served by the few who run with what help they can bring.

It is open to us to sit down with the rest, helpless, even cynical and sceptical in the face of the mystery of it all—the problem of suffering, the apparent defeat of the good, and the seeming hopelessness of prayer. Or, understanding as little of it as any of them, we may run and do what can be done, to discover that understanding comes in the doing, and that we have done more than we ever imagined possible; done something to bring back the smile of God to one who thought it was blotted out for evermore.

Thou sayest this sad day 'I thirst' again,
And I, remembering how, to ease Thy pain,
Some harsh-faced Roman, stained and scarred with
war,
Gave Thee his vinegar,
(And earned a fuller comfort than he gave),
Go forth to seek for Thee at Thy behest
Not only such suave souls as please me best,
But rough, sour souls that Thou didst parch to
save![1]

---

[1] H. L. Simpson, *The Nameless Longing*, 218.

Entre Nous.

Alfred E. Garvie.

The name of Dr. A. E. Garvie needs no introduction to the readers of this magazine or for that matter to any who are interested in religious life. But whatever the degree of knowledge of this outstanding personality the details of his life and work given by him in such a fine objective way in *Memories and Meanings of my Life*, just issued by Allen & Unwin (8s. 6d. net), cannot fail to be of great interest.

The autobiography opens in Poland in the town of Zyrardow where his father was one of the directors of a textile factory. His grandparents had emigrated to Poland as a result of financial difficulties after the Napoleonic wars. Garvie was one of a large family, all closely united in family affection. He cherished a pardonable pride in his father as the ideal captain of industry, as much concerned for the welfare of the workers as the profits of the shareholders. His brother Thomas was a man of the same type, and there is a fine story told of his last journey from Archangel to Mourmansk where he died, in 1918, after undergoing great privations. ‘A fellow-traveller sent me an account of his last days. As we knew him, he was a tall and stout man, but she described him as the small white-haired old gentleman who was like a ministering angel to the refugees, advising and helping whenever he could. On the steamer he insisted, ill as he was, on giving up his cabin to a mother with children. His end was as his life had been—unselfish service.’

The early chapters of the volume contain a valuable historical picture of Poland under Russian rule. Many of his memories were painful, and a number of unforgettable stories are told. These experiences of his youth, he says, ‘may explain why, although I strive by God’s grace to be as meek as Moses, I sometimes blaze with indignation at any instances of tyranny, and am very jealous of any infringement of personal liberty.’ In Poland Garvie laid the foundations of his mastery of foreign languages so useful in his international work. When he came to Scotland at the age of twelve he already spoke Polish, French, Russian and German.

After his school days at George Watson’s college—where he left as Dux of the commercial side—he was apprenticed for four years to the drapery trade, working in a wholesale warehouse in Glasgow. He found the business training of value later, and he says of it in his engaging way, ‘I trust that those with whom I have had to do since have discovered that a minister and even a professor can be businesslike and a man of affairs.’

His keenest interest, however, was already the spread of the gospel and Christian ideals, and the lad who each Sunday evening planned and prepared three or four addresses for the following Sunday, and who had already presided over one meeting at nine-thirty, another at eleven, attended Church service in the afternoon, given the address at a mission-hall meeting, and in the evening spoken at an evangelistic meeting, was the protagonist of the man whose almost incredibly numerous and many-sided Christian activities have been the admiration and envy of those who know him.

After four years Garvie found that it was not business but the preaching of the gospel that was to be his life’s work. His call was to the Congregational Ministry—the Presbyterian church of which he was then a member not offering him at that time sufficient religious liberty. But ‘all the narrowness and even harshness which I met in these evangelical circles, much as I disliked it, did not provoke a reaction against evangelical theology; and, although all my doubts and difficulties were not at once removed, gradually the conviction was deepened that so sinful a world needed so great a Saviour as God in His love had given.’

Dr. Garvie took his Arts course at Glasgow and his Theological at Mansfield College, Oxford. After two short pastorates in Scotland (Morley wrote of him while he was in Montrose: ‘It did me good to think of a bright light of thought, knowledge, interest, burning away on this far-off shore’) he went to London where he spent the next thirty years, only retiring from the Principalship of Hackney and New College in 1933. His influence during these years has been as great as his activities have been outstanding. The college work that would have been more than enough for most men took only a part of his time. Preaching, church work, committee work, international and ecumenical conferences—he was Chairman of the Congregational Union, Chairman of the London Missionary Society, Vice-chairman of Copec, took an important part in the Stockholm Conference of 1925, and was deputy Chairman of the Lausanne Faith and Order Conference—and much important literary work were all fitted in.

Some of Dr. Garvie’s earliest literary work appeared in this magazine to which he is still a valued contributor. He began to write for it in 1893 when he was at Montrose—his first contribution apparently being a review of Dr. Bruce's *Apologetics*. We may be excused if we quote his tribute to Dr. Hastings. 'A more considerate and courteous editor I have never met.' (We notice a slight slip in referring to the articles which he contributed to the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. He speaks of the first five volumes as being edited by Dr. James Hastings instead of all the twelve volumes).

He has always had an 'itch for writing,' and the Bibliography contains the titles of thirty-eight books in addition to all his contributions to dictionaries and encyclopædias, magazines and newspapers. It is an amazing output, and when one remembers his many other activities one wonders how it has been possible.

It is doubtful if Dr. Garvie could have carried through all these multifarious activities had it not been for his happy home life. After his wife's death he speaks of her as 'my life's best gift,' and she herself said just before the end, 'Ours has been a perfect marriage.'

Has he dissipated his energies? We have no doubt of the answer ourselves, but we will put it in Dr. Garvie's own words; for he has the most disarming way of meeting possible criticism: 'I admit imperfect service everywhere, but I doubt if I could have done better by doing less. I have not an antithetic but a synthetic mind, and even, by God's reconciling Spirit, a reconciling disposition. Accordingly, I have always been led to see God, God's world, God's purpose in the world, God's summons to His Church as His dependent and subordinate organ " steadily and see it *whole*." All my interests and all my activities have had a unity of motive, whatever variety of method may have been necessary. No Christian service, for which I had opportunity, and had any capacity, was alien to me; I have not been able to say " No," whenever in a human need I heard a divine call. Two sayings of Paul's have inspired my thought, sentiment, effort: " All things are yours, for ye are Christ's and Christ is God's " and " I am become all things to all men that I may by all means save some."

'There is a danger of losing the one thing needful, the better part, in being troubled about many things, and I have recognized and sought to guard against the danger. Dare I believe that the many books which I have written about the things of God show not only some learning from books, but also disclose a " life hid with Christ in God "—an inner life of which the aspiration, and endeavour, has been " to be crucified " to sin, and " to be raised again in newness of life with Christ "? I have sought as motive the constraining love of Christ, and as method the guidance of the spirit.'

Faith and Works.

During the time when he was having a business training in Glasgow—before he went to the University—A. E. Garvie was a member of Sydney Place Church. Every Sunday morning he presided over the senior meeting of a service for young people of both sexes called the Foundry Boy meeting. 'One of these lads, who caused much anxiety, told me with great excitement that he was converted. I asked him, " Does your wife know? " He answered, " I telt her." He was a very unkind husband, and so I added, " What I mean is, are you treating her now as you ought? " With much surprise he asked what that had to do with his conversion. When I began to explain the moral obligations conversion involved, he said, as he went off: " I see ye dinna ken onything aboot it." His conversion was a flash in the pan, and we lost some of our influence over him.'

The Empty Church.

THE merits of the *Liverpool Diocesan Review*, edited by the Bishop of Liverpool, are well known. The January issue has an article by the Rev. C. W. Budden, M.A., M.D., Ch.B., Vicar of St. Mildred's, Croydon, in which he considers the reasons of the empty church. 'The late G. K. Chesterton once said in defence of his paradoxes that if one turns a thing upside down, something will fall out. . . . What do I mean by suggesting the Church has got things upside down? Well, if the question were put: What is the first purpose of a church? The answer would probably be to provide for worship. And if the question be pressed as to the most important act of worship, the reply is, generally, the service of Holy Communion. And this is exactly where I think we have got things upside down, and why the people have dropped out. The word " church " in its original conception was not used of a *building* but of a *congregation*. There were no church buildings in the first years of Christianity. The early Christians met in each other's houses. Our Lord erected no buildings and laid no foundation stones except figurative ones. He founded a fellowship. Fellowship comes first in the order of time, and if we are to build up Church life to-day, fellowship must be given the first emphasis. . . .

'The social life of the Church can be its biggest gateway. In olden days (those blessed mediæval times when the priest had it all his own way—which makes it so attractive to a certain type of person) the Church was the centre of the life of the people. We can at least restore that healthy ideal, though we leave the priestcraft out of the programme. . . .

'When our Lord began His ministry His first act was a social one. His second was to preach a sermon, and the test of that sermon was deeply significant. It was from Isaiah: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised."

'The Church to-day says that the sacrament of Holy Communion must be given first place, but in our Lord's ministry it came last. There we have things upside down. The Church's first task is to convert. Conversions are not so popular to-day as a few years ago, but that is only because the word has fallen into disfavour. The *process* is as essential as ever. . . . We value the sacrament of Holy Communion, but its purpose is to strengthen and restore the faithful so that they can fight their Lord's battles. But as no man can fight if he is a captive, he must first be released. The preaching of the gospel is the essential first step, and that was Christ's method. In this I submit that our Church procedure is decidely upside down, for if Evangelism is pressed, it is "by the dockside" or in some other inaccessible place. . . .

'A few years ago, when Re-union was the topic of the day, much was said about a "Quadrilateral." In conclusion I offer a quadrilateral. Let us pray that we may ever cultivate and retain that open ear which enables us to hear the call to high endeavour; the open mind which will welcome new light of knowledge; the open eyes which will be quick to discover God's indwelling in the hearts of our fellow-men and women at present outside the Church; and the open hands which will be ready to share with those whom we consider less fortunate than ourselves. In short, let us first be Christians and then Christian Anglicans.'

Holy Places in Palestine.

Dr. W. M. Christie, of Haifa, has written a stirring article on Palestine in *The British Weekly* for January 6. The title is 'No Peace Obtainable Through Partition.' This article should receive the closest attention, and Dr. Christie's reputation is sufficient to ensure that it will do so. Among other things he deals with the attitude of the Jews to Christian holy places. 'There is not a doubt that "multitudes in Israel" are determined to blot out the evidences of Christianity, and warnings have been given: "Take away your dead Christ from our Holy Land."'

Among the examples which he gives are the following: 'We have the notorious case of Agrippa's Wall. This, the Third Wall, was built between the years A.D. 42 and 44 at about 800 metres north of the present Damascus Gate. Excavations laid bare hundreds of metres. Personally, I took the works of Josephus (who knew that wall very well and has described it fully), measured the towers, studied the line in relationship to the city, examined the stones, and gathered all evidences, and was fully convinced, as all other examiners have been, as to its genuineness.

'Even then I was not done, for on getting home, Josephus was again examined in the Greek text. A portion of this wall ought to have been left as a National Monument, but nothing has been done. The whole evidence of the wall's existence has been blotted out, except one stone where two roads diverge, and, in the interests of motor cars, that will have to go. We asked why there had been no declaration regarding this important monument of antiquity, nor preservation of part of it, and the only answer we could get was, "there are vested interests." . . .

'There is the desecration of the Sea of Galilee. Away back in 1883 the late Lord Curzon wrote: "We reach its summit and suddenly at one step are presented with an entirely new and wonderful prospect. Deep down below us lies the Sea of Galilee. The most hardened sensibilities must confess to a thrill of genuine emotion. We are looking upon the most sacred sheet of water in the world, upon the now glassy but erstwhile stormy surface whereon the Saviour walked, upon the shores which He trod, upon the scenes of His most active and most successful ministrations."

'Now it is practically a mill dam, with levels changed at the will of, and to suit the convenience of, the Electric Corporation. Filled up to overflowing at one time, covering the paths the Saviour and Apostles trod, at other times with broad burning foreshores, stony and rough, destroying geographical relations through which the identity of sites can be proved. . . .

'Christian rights in this most sacred site, the beloved of every thinking Christian and Bible reader, are betrayed by "Christian" *statesmen* in the interests of Jewish dividends. And complacently the Jew accepts. "You cannot indict a whole people," the Jew tells us. We agree, but a whole people can indict itself, and not a single Jew has raised his voice as an advocate of any Christian rights in the Holy Land. . . . All that we want is that the Sea of Galilee be left as intact and inviolable to the Christian world as the Wailing Wall was left to the Jew.'

In reading this article one has to remember that it has not been written by some one antagonistic to the Jews but by a man who has always been their friend. After the War, Dr. Christie did not spare himself in his work for the Jewish people, in Poland and the adjacent lands, who had been rendered destitute and homeless.

Standards.

'Many moderns to-day have surrendered to the idea that there are no standards of character, or any reliable criteria of right and wrong. . . . Go into a scientific laboratory and tell them there are no standards in their work, and they will throw you out. That is their central business—standards of induction, of verification, of technique, and behind those, profound standards of veracity and of disinterested devotion to the truth. Wherever we find great work being done, in music, art, or science, amid the infinite variety of expressions, we find at the core and centre of it all standards, concerning which men are certain that nowhere can their disregard be right and their observance wrong.

'Nor is it otherwise in great character! Show us a time or place where you really think it is right to be disloyal, insincere, cruel—right to take ruthless advantage of another's weakness, or to betray a trust! Show us a time or place where Judas Iscariot and Benedict Arnold are right! There are standards of character.'[1]

War in China.

The following translation of a poem by Toyohiko Kagawa has appeared in *The Christian Century*.

Ah tears! Unbidden tears!
Familiar friends since childhood's lonely years,
Long separated we,
Why do ye come again to dwell with me?

At midnight, dawn, midday
Ye come; nor wait your coming nor delay;
Nay fearless, with what scorn
Ye picture China by my brothers torn.

Your scorn I must accept,
But I'm no coward; pray heed ere more ye've wept;
I love Japan so fair,
And China too; this war I cannot bear.

'Is there no other way?'
Thus do I search my spirit all the day
Nor ever reach a goal;
I live, but only as a phantom soul.

Like Christ who bore our sins upon the Cross,
I, too, must bear my country's sins and dross;
Land of my love! Thy sins are grievous to be borne,
My head hangs low upon my form forlorn.

Ah tears! Unbidden tears!
Long separated we,
Alas! has come another day
When ye must dwell with me.

Easter School of Theology, St. Andrews.

The School of Theology will be held this year in University Hall, St. Andrews, from Monday, March 28th, to Friday, April 1st. The principal lecturers are Professor T. H. Robinson from Cardiff, whose subject is Readings in Isaiah, and Professor C. J. Cadoux, from Oxford, whose subject is The Eschatology of Jesus. Members of St. Mary's College Staff will also lecture. There are opportunities for discussion and recreation. This is the only school of the kind in Scotland, and it is open to ministers of all denominations. Circulars with fuller particulars will be sent out in a few days to former members of the school. Others may obtain particulars on writing to The Secretary, Easter School, St. Mary's College, St. Andrews.

Erratum.

We regret that the word 'dependable' on p. 220, column 2, line 49, of Dr. Smart's article on *The Return of Theology to the Church* in the February number should have appeared as 'defendable.'

---

[1] Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

The latest of the 'Westminster Books' bears the title *Why Did Jesus Die?* and is written by Professor J. G. Riddell of the Chair of Systematic Theology in the University of Glasgow (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). It is difficult at this late date to say anything new about the Atonement. And indeed Professor Riddell does not profess to have a new or original theory of the Atonement or anything of the kind. What he has done in this little book is to state afresh the main explanations that have been offered of the Cross, and re-emphasize the contribution which each of them makes to our understanding of the saving work of Christ.

He makes certain points clear to begin with. The Cross is unique and central in the faith and also for evangelism. There is no one orthodox theory of it which could be proclaimed as the message of the Church. And finally, it is not the sufferings of the Cross that are to be considered in any theory of the Atonement. We must also take into view the earthly ministry of Jesus and His Resurrection life. Not Calvary alone but Bethlehem and Galilee are part of the same problem. The Cross is not an isolated fact. With these things assumed, the writer proceeds to expound the five great theories of the Atonement, which may be briefly comprehended in these five words: *Revelation*, *Satisfaction*, *Sacrifice*, *Victory*, and *Life*.

The Cross is a *revelation* of God's love. That is the first answer given to the question: Why did Jesus die? The two names most closely associated with this view are those of McLeod Campbell (in 'The Nature of the Atonement') and Horace Bushnell (in 'The Vicarious Sacrifice'). The sufferings of Christ, said Campbell, were the perfecting of the Son's witnessing for the Father, 'being the perfected manifestation of the life of love as sonship towards God and brotherhood towards man.' The Cross, said Bushnell, signifies that 'such a God in love, must be such a Saviour in suffering.' The work of Christ, as Redeemer and Reconciler, was to bring believers to share His own awareness of God and His nearness to the Father, and to enable them to partake in the blessedness of such fellowship. This is so obviously true, or part of the truth, that it need not be elaborated.

The second theory is that Christ offered *satisfaction* to God and through His death forgiveness was purchased for man. 'He died that we might be forgiven.' This has been the answer to our question most common for seven hundred years. Christ came not only, or mainly, to reveal God's love, but by His death to bring forgiveness to sinful men. Scripture dwells on the fact that Christ came into the world to save sinners—that man's desperate need drew Him from heaven to earth. The assertion that the Cross is a revelation of love is true, but it does not represent what the Bible means by Reconciliation.

Dr. Vincent Taylor in his study of the Passion-sayings of our Lord holds that in all Jesus said and taught 'there is nothing to suggest that His object in dying was so to confront men with the untiring love of God that through penitence and contrition they should be brought to love and trust Him in return.' The Cross is redemptive in the sense that the pardon of our sins depends upon Christ's death. If God and man are to be reconciled it cannot be by the simple expedient of ignoring sin but only by overcoming it. The Cross is not merely a revelation, it is a mighty work. This view has been so fully and repeatedly presented in Dr. Denney's well-known books that it is not necessary to expound it further.

The third answer is *sacrifice*. This thought is no less important than those of revelation and satisfaction. It has been maintained that during the first four or five centuries, till Augustine, the Church remained true to the Biblical view of sacrifice as fundamental in Atonement, and that only misunderstandings of this doctrine have prevented its wider acceptance. Brunner is among those who agree that 'the ritual idea' of the Cross as an expiatory sacrifice intended to remove some obstacle which has come between God and man is necessary. It is also contended that only in the conception of sacrifice can the Incarnation, the Cross, the Resurrection, and the Ascension be truly linked together in their inseparable unity. We must not be guilty of 'the fatal identification between sacrifice and death.'

It is to be remembered that the sufferings of Christ—the anguish borne in His death—are not themselves a sufficient clue to the meaning of the Cross. The sufferings are not the Atonement. The sacrifice of Jesus is obedience vested in that act, at once inward and outward, in which He gave the life needed by the Father's reconciling will. It is not the shedding of blood at Calvary but the spirit underlying and expressed in the sacrifice that gave it all its worth. And the sacrifice is the offering which Christ, as the representative of man, presents to the Father on his behalf. It is through this surrendered life, this offered sacrifice, that men are perfectly reconciled to God and know that their every sin may be forgiven. And it is everywhere emphasized that the sacrifice is made by God. 'God was in Christ . . . God was behind the sacrifice; indeed, He was within it.'

The fourth word is *victory*. It is a familiar fact that before Anselm the current idea of the death of Christ was that it was a ransom paid to the Devil. This was accepted unquestioningly for nine hundred years. It seemed a crude idea. At the same time nothing lasts for nine hundred years without containing some truth and substance. And Bishop Aulén in his recent book, 'Christus Victor,' asks us to return to what he calls the 'classic' view of the Atonement. Not in its bizarre form, of course, but to a view of the Cross as God's victory over evil. The question really is, what opposition to God's purpose had to be overcome in the redemption of mankind and how the divine victory was won. In other words, the primary concern is with the conflict fought out for the sake of humanity, in which Christ is the great protagonist, and only secondarily with the questions of revelation, satisfaction, or sacrifice.

This sense of a spiritual warfare, as the truest characteristic of the work of Christ, and of His achievement on man's behalf, was, it is held, the distinctive note of the Early Church's teaching, and ought never to be forgotten. The idea of a ransom paid to Satan was only an inadequate attempt to express the far-reaching truth that the doctrine of Atonement must be presented in dramatic form, and that conflict and victory are at the heart of reconciliation. Threatening the welfare of the human race there appears an array of hostile forces of all kinds, material and spiritual. From the tyranny of these Christ sets His followers free, and, in the triumph of the Cross, He vindicates the divine purpose and routs the enemies of God and man.

The final word is *life*. Ten years ago Nicolas Berdyaev, a Russian thinker exiled in Paris, dealt with the problem of 'Redemption and Evil' in a book translated under the title 'Freedom and the

Spirit,' in which he finds a clue to the meaning of Reconciliation in the indwelling and transforming presence of Christ with men. The main theme is that of a spiritual union between the believer and his Lord. The possibility of new life for men is the outcome of Christ's Incarnation, of His Death and Resurrection, through the operation of the Holy Spirit. Instead of the yearning for deliverance, we should speak of the search after the higher life and the transfiguring of all creation.

Many are saved, it is said, not *by* Christ but *in* Christ, in the new spiritual race which Christ began, in the new nature, in the new spiritual life. That is the truth emphasized in the view quoted above. And its value is obvious. It is, for example, a safeguard against a tendency to regard the death of Jesus as a transaction, wrought out between the Father and the Son, of which men remain spectators, though their fate may depend on the issue. Even so orthodox a theologian as Professor H. R. Mackintosh could write: 'By making union with Christ central and determinative in this matter of forgiveness and its conditions, we do justice to a spiritual instinct which declares that by no possibility can we be saved outside ourselves.'

Professor RIDDELL's summing up is an interesting one. He points out that every one of these theories contains part of the truth, though he does not attempt to put them together into a whole! Nor does he say clearly *what* is the gospel of Christ's death that we are to present to men inside or outside the Church. He also points out, with some originality, that all these theories are found in Scripture, and that we find the same variousness in Christian piety—witness the hymns. There are many doorways into the Holy Place. 'We stand before a manifold, which nevertheless is a great, unity.'

Can the ideas associated with the kingdom of God, the Son of Man, and the Lord's Supper, be treated legitimately so as to form a uniform conception? This plainly was the belief of the late Rudolf OTTO, and now that his great work, *Reich Gottes und Menschensohn* (1934), has been translated into English, it is possible for a much larger circle of readers to follow his arguments and estimate their importance.

The translation, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, is reviewed later in the present number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, and we take the opportunity of referring also to the review of the original German edition in Vol. XLVI. 282 f. Here, it is sufficient to illustrate OTTO's leading ideas.

OTTO maintains that the common belief that Jesus brings the kingdom is completely foreign to Jesus Himself. 'On the contrary,' he says, 'the kingdom brings him with it' (p. 103). His own activity lies in, and is carried forward by, the tidal wave of the victory of God Himself over Satan. This is implied in the words of Jesus: 'I saw Satan fall from Heaven like lightning,' a saying which has been preserved almost by a miracle, since 'it contradicts all the later Christology.' It is in the power of the divine victory that Jesus works by the finger of God, that is, 'with dynamis, exousia, charis, charisma,' and His charismatic activity is 'nothing other and nothing less than the coming of the kingdom itself' (p. 104).

'He does not bring the kingdom, but he himself, according to the most certain of his utterances, is in his actions the personal manifestation of the inbreaking divine power' (p. 104). 'His person and work were part of a comprehensive redemptive event, which broke in with him and which he called the coming and actual arrival of the kingdom of God.'

The bearing of such a view on the Person of Jesus is obviously close. In the submission of OTTO, He cannot be a rabbi who uttered maxims and gained disciples, and was only later elevated to the miraculous sphere. 'He knew himself to be a part and an organ of the eschatological order itself, which was pressing in to save. Thereby he was lifted above John and every one earlier. He was the eschatological saviour. Only thus understood are all his deeds and words seen against their right background and in their true meaning' (p. 107). The clue to this belief is to be found in the Book of Enoch, for though Jesus was not an apocalyptist, He was dependent upon apocalyptic tradition.

It is an arresting suggestion to be told that the Son of Man in the Book of Enoch is a soteriological figure, and that, in this respect, he is like the Servant of God in Second Isaiah. 'Fundamentally different though this Servant of God is from Enoch they have it in common that, in both, a preacher of the approaching eschatological order walks upon earth and is himself predestined to eschatological dignity. A further common feature is that both determined Jesus' world of thought' (p. 218). Otto is convinced that the belief which Jesus held concerning His Person is 'a clear synthesis of the Son of Man and Isaiah's Servant of God' (p. 252).

In discussions of this kind it is obviously impossible to stop short of the work of Christ. Otto recognizes that Jesus offered no theory of atonement. 'He simply expressed the idea that, by the humble and voluntary surrender of life on the part of the Son of Man, the many would gain what the disciples of the Servant of God had gained by the suffering of their master, viz. the possibility of entering as reconciled individuals into a *berith* of God, which inheriting the kingdom of God made possible and assured to them' (p. 260). In this is revealed the significance of the procedure of Jesus at the Last Supper; 'it was an eschatological and regal act of the Son of Man, who was also the atoning, suffering Servant of God.'

Why is it that at the moment there is a marked tendency to emphasize the importance of the Supper in connexion with the Atonement? It is certainly not to be explained by a willingness to rest in the externals of religion rather than to press on into the inner courts. The very reverse is true; and it is significant that the emphasis is most marked in the contributions of New Testament scholars with reference to the sayings of Jesus. Christ's action at the Supper, as Otto sees it, is more than a mere prediction of His suffering as the Son of Man and Servant of God; 'it was an acted, anticipatory prediction by representation; even more was it the gift of a share in the power of the thing represented, viz. in the atoning power of the broken Christ' (p. 304). Naturally, to a Roman Catholic scholar, like August Arnold, this is not an adequate description of the Supper; since, while recognizing the One Sacrifice in the Death of Christ, he prefers to see in the Eucharist the sacrificial Passover Meal of the New Covenant. Otto's conception is rather that of 'a feast upon a sacrifice,' although he emphasizes strongly, in view of Lk 22^{29}, the Covenant-associations of the Supper, and the opportunity which it gives of entering into the redeeming act of Christ.

We have said enough to indicate the stimulating character of Otto's work. It should be added, however, that it is a challenge as well as a stimulus. There are many places in the argument where the discerning reader will pause and ask questions. Otto is very much on his guard against the spectre of later developments, and is ready to say: 'Here the theology of the Church is beginning to press in.' He thinks that the later Christology displaced that of Christ Himself, and that later sacramental teaching obscured the connexion of the Supper with the death of Christ. In the end, therefore, Otto brings us to the vital question in present-day discussions: 'To what extent is later Christianity rooted in the teaching and action of Jesus Himself?' We believe that he leaves us with too sharp a breach between the beginnings and the end of the long process; but, in any case, and this is of the highest importance, the beginnings, in Otto's discussion, are not the bleak colourless affirmations of the so-called Liberal Theology, but rich and productive regions out of which Pauline Christianity and the later Catholic Church arose as by an inevitable and legitimate process.

The new psychology is not generally regarded as an ally of religion, and least of all of the Christian faith. By its analysis of the low and brutish origin of human emotions and impulses it would seem to deny the divine in man and to cut him off from contact with a higher world. Indeed, some of its chief exponents have expressly denied the reality of that higher world, and have explained away man's belief in it as sheer illusion.

On the other hand, however, the serious student of the new psychology is struck with curious resemblances to what one may call Biblical psychology. In its analysis of human nature the new psychology does not treat evil lightly. On the contrary, it finds a deep corruption which penetrates far down into the unconscious, and it uses language reminiscent of the doctrine of original sin. It also declares that man needs to be profoundly changed if he is to overcome his inhibitions and neuroses and attain to self-confidence and settled peace. It cannot tell by what power that change is to be wrought. Here it is weakest, but it does point, somewhat vaguely perhaps, in the direction of the Christian solution.

It is therefore possible to interpret the new psychology as, at least in a negative sort of way, a *preparatio evangelica*, and in wise Christian hands it may be made a schoolmaster leading men to Christ. This is a point of view which is taken in *The Achievement of Personality*, by Miss Grace STUART, M.A., B.Litt. (S.C.M.; 5s. net), and is there set forth in an interesting and impressive way.

The three outstanding names in the field of the new psychology are Freud, Jung, and Adler. They differ in their diagnosis of the master passions, but they are at one in their view of the grave disorder within man's soul and of the general unsatisfactoriness of human behaviour. 'For Jung modern man has become merely neurotic. Freud sees men asking themselves whether this fragment (of progress in the regulation of human affairs) that has been acquired by culture is indeed worth defending at all. . . . It is hardly surprising that nervous breakdowns are common, and that neurasthenia, or nerve fatigue, is the most significant disease of the age.' The inner man, in a word, is a machine which has broken down, and needs repair if it is to work smoothly and efficiently. Some very thorough reorganization of the personality is required, not only of the conscious mind and will, but also of the deep emotional forces which, untrained and unharnessed, may make havoc of mind and will and effort.

All the manifold powers and emotions of the soul must be built into a system, and brought under the control of some all-inclusive and master sentiment which shall maintain them in harmony and harness their energies to the highest uses. McDougall has described this supreme sentiment as 'a system of instinctive-emotional dispositions centred about one supreme object. . . . What should that object be? Clearly it should be the universe as a perfected system, as the full realization of the Good, the Beautiful, and the True. Thinking in terms of personality, or on the analogy of personality, one would say that the object is a personal or superpersonal God.'

In Freud's psychology the deepest instinct in man is a need for love. By his use of the term libido with its gross associations, and of sexual terminology in general, he has laid himself open to misunderstanding and to just criticism, but there is much truth in his view. He pictures the undisciplined ego as profoundly selfish, pursuing its ends with ruthless disregard for the good of others. Presently in its self-seeking it comes up against a hard world which will not give way, and then the bitterness of frustrated desire may lead to a neurosis. 'People fall ill of a neurosis when the possibility of satisfaction for the libido is removed from them—they fall in consequence of a frustration.' What way of escape is there from this unhappy clash of desires? Freud recognizes that the libido or craving for love has in itself a germ of hope. It is the sentiment which binds groups and communities into one. So the libido must somehow escape from the prison-house of self and go outwards in love to others. Turned in upon self in narcissism, or self-love, it is a death principle: turned out to an object beyond itself, it is a principle of life. 'The new psychology, discovering here a law of life, has perhaps reaffirmed an old statement that "the wages of sin is death," giving to the words sin and death a connotation intelligible to the modern world. Living to yourself is sin—a sin that is quite likely to kill some one else and almost certain, unless you renounce it, to kill you.'

Adler, at first one of Freud's most devoted pupils, broke away from his master and found the key to human desire and action in a predominant 'will to power.' 'The individual is ceaselessly striving to assert himself upon the level of human intelligibility . . . the fundamental striving of the soul for self-existence demands this. The individual must feel himself to be a being with *meaning*, for otherwise he cannot have human importance.' The neurotic is one who, being engrossed in his struggle for recognition, and being in some way frustrated in that struggle, turns in upon himself and perhaps tries to force recognition by illness or in some illegitimate way. The neurotic, as Adler sees, must be brought out of his isolation and turned into a social being. He must be made willing, instead of seeking to dominate, simply to serve. And this, Adler points out, will eventually bring him real power. 'Not that this feels like power, nor is it exercised with any relish of dominion. It feels like peace, for it is the true goal of the will, and the right compensation for the weakness of individual existence.' With great candour Adler admits that this transformation is not easily accomplished.

Jung's analysis of human nature is perhaps more comprehensive than Freud's or Adler's, but, while admitting the truth in their views, he lays most stress on man's desire for security which he takes as predominant. Man is born to strive and conquer, and if he is true to his highest instinct he will find his environment not merely hostile but helpful, providing the material which he can mould and adapt to his own use, making it 'the very stuff of a fuller and completer life.' This life-task has for Jung something of the urgency of those Gospel stories that show such extraordinary insight into the law of life itself. Man sees the treasure which he knows to be good, but he must sell all that he has to become possessor of it. 'The entire libido is demanded for the battle of life, and there is no remaining behind.' Again, 'If the adult personality is to have anything to develop, the infantile, pleasure-seeking, egotistic personality must be ruthlessly sacrificed, and it is sometimes not pleasant. But he that loseth that life, shall save his real life.'

It is easy to see how near much of this comes to the Christian view of man's sinful nature and of human life. Jung indeed draws attention to what he calls 'the great wisdom of life of the Christian faith, which for two thousand years has proved to be efficacious,' and elsewhere he speaks of the Cross as 'the frank admission that, not only are the lower wishes to be sacrificed, but the whole personality. It demands complete devotion, it compels a veritable sacrifice of self to a higher purpose.' So convinced is Jung of the need of religion that he declares his belief that if all religions were destroyed man would begin all over again to build some faith for himself. At the same time, by a curious contradiction, Jung professes unbelief in the reality of that which underlies religion, and sees mankind pitifully 'fleeing from the hardship of the reality which he knows, to the unreality of its religious myths.'

From all this it is manifest that the new psychology leaves an aching void, which the Christian faith as manifestly is fitted to fill. The psychologists are themselves conscious of the void. Their power to diagnose is greater than their power to heal. 'The analysis has been all right. The patient has learnt all the hows and whys of his mind—he has seen the wheels go round. Then he goes off, rather burdened with the knowledge of his disabilities, and doesn't necessarily make a job of living after all.'

What is needed is a divine dynamic. Let self-love be transformed into love of others, says Freud; let will to power become willingness to serve, says Adler; let the life-energy be expended in self-sacrifice, says Jung. But where is the power that will suffice to work these miracles? Well, where one is greatly beloved, it becomes easy to love in return, and, where love is, service and sacrifice cease to be a burden and become a joy. And it need not be said that this divine love is revealed in the gospel and has transformed innumerable lives.

Ecstasy.

By the Reverend Professor John Mauchline, B.D., University of Glasgow.

Ecstasy we may define as the name applied to those types of experience in which the experient becomes temporarily alienated from the physical and sensible world, and enters into rapport with a whole field of consciousness which is denied him in his normal state. It has to be admitted, of course, that a narrower definition of the word is often accepted, and it is used especially to refer to the more demonstrative and spectacular manifestations of ecstasy, but we prefer to use the word in its wider connotation. As we use it, it is quite a comprehensive term; for there are many kinds of ecstasy, differentiated by the nature of the stimuli which produce it, the phenomena which accompany it, and the results which follow it.

(1) *Collective, self-induced ecstasy.* As the name we have given to it implies, this is the type which is manifested only in a group or crowd, and is further defined as being that type in which the sharers themselves employ methods to induce the desired experience.

(2) *Collective, passive ecstasy.* In this case the members of the group themselves do not induce the experience, but are acted upon by an external agent or external agents. It is very seldom that one agent alone is operative, and the determination of the dominant agent in producing the ecstatic state is often very difficult; but within this class there are two principal types to which we would refer:

(*a*) That in which the ecstatic state is produced in the experient by the psychological influence of the group or crowd, of which he is a member.

(*b*) That in which it is produced by a group-leader.

(3) *Individual ecstasy.* Here the experient is alone, apart from any group, and by self-discipline, by concentration, and in other ways reaches a state of ecstasy.

We now propose to speak of each of these types in turn.

(1) *Collective, self-induced ecstasy.*—A clear example of this is given in the Old Testament, in the description of the prophets of Baal on Mt. Carmel.[1] There is no mention of a leader, so that we may legitimately infer that if there was one, his leadership was regulative and directive rather than anything else. In the vehemence of their entreaty, these prophets became worked up into a state of frenzy, which was characterized by wild leaping and violent movements, by bodily lacerations and frantic howlings. Ovid, in a passage in his *Metamorphoses*, tells of a band of ecstatics who were devotees of the goddess of Syria, and gives a graphic description of their pantings and gesticulations, their howlings and their lacerations, while in the ecstatic state.[2] We remember, in this connexion, the Dancing Dervishes, who, at their *zikr*, under the direction of a leader, recite portions of the Koran as they dance round a circular enclosure, until they become totally unconscious of their surroundings, recitation and dance become faster and faster, and in the end the participants collapse upon the floor. Mention might be made of some of the later manifestations of the Jansenist movement in the south of France. Amazing scenes were often enacted at the grave of a certain young Jansenist; the assembled company, by self-torture, would work themselves into a state of ecstasy, in which they prophesied and cured diseases.

We need not multiply examples further. Certain facts about ecstatic experiences of this kind will have already become manifest:

(*a*) We get the definite impression, especially in the cases of the Dancing Dervishes and the Jansenists, that the time and the place were important.

(*b*) Although the examples we have chosen do not illustrate this, various stimuli might be used to induce the ecstatic state. Drink, music, hashish, and dancing were among the commonest.[3]

(*c*) When the ecstasy is in being, glossolalia may occur, and in many cases one man plays the part of spokesman for the group. We remember the case of Zedekiah among the prophets of Ahab of Israel.[4]

(*d*) When a group is in a state of ecstasy, there appears to be a contagious quality present, so that the individual coming into contact with the group becomes infected.

---

[1] 1 K 18.

[2] *Metamorphoses*, viii. 24–29.

[3] Cf. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, ii. 416 f.

[4] 1 K 22^{11}.

(2*a*) *Collective, passive ecstasy*, in which the external agency is a group or crowd.

We remember how Saul, as anointed king, was sent away by Samuel to meet a group of *nebi'im*, and how he became enthused and prophesied.[1] We are, presumably, to infer that Saul was a passive agent, acted upon by the group. Again, Euripides gives us a memorable picture of how Pentheus of Thebes went out to Cithaeron's glens to view the Bacchanalian orgies, and became gripped by the frenzy.[2] It is relevant to mention here the Tarantism of Italy in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The belief evidently spread that the bite of the Tarantula spider was deadly. Many who were bitten actually died; and the others could be aroused from their torpor only by the playing of the flute, which made them rise up and dance furiously, as if in a state of enchantment.[3] Hecker also gives us interesting descriptions of the Dancing Mania of Germany of the fourteenth century, a mania which was liable to take possession of those who watched the delirious dancing of ones already affected.[4]

In this type of ecstasy we have been considering, we notice the effect of a group or a crowd upon an individual. Often the individual is pre-disposed to affection by his possessing some fear or illusion; when he is alone, reason and will may keep these in subjection; but when he comes into contact with an ecstatic group, the higher centres of control are relaxed.[5] Where there is no pre-disposition to affection in the individual who comes into contact with the ecstatic group, his initial mental state is often one of curiosity; that gives way to astonishment at the weird phenomena, to fascination by the rhythmic movements of those in ecstasy; then follows the relaxation of the inhibitions to emotion and action, the overshadowing of reason, and the paralysis of the will; and the individual becomes absorbed in the group.

(2*b*) *Collective, passive ecstasy*, in which the external agency is a group-leader. We recognize that in this type the influence of the group or crowd is operative, but the dominant influence is that of the leader. The main stimuli come from him, and are often deliberately applied by him. The expert leader develops a science of stimulation. We can find illustrations in almost every religious revival, for almost all revivals of the religious consciousness among a people are due to the work and witness of individuals. Several interesting illustrations are to be found in John Wesley's *Journal*. Some tell of amazing scenes during his preaching, when scores fell before him as dead, and many cried out, wildly gesticulating.[6] It is Dimond who says: 'If we admit that the crowd is the primitive, biological herd, Wesley was an eminently skilful herd-leader.'[7] But such a herd-leader or group-leader has very definite methods of procedure. It is possible for a crowd to be so dull and unresponsive that he can achieve no results at all. He must use means such as music to get a 'psychological crowd.' The means used have often been described as 'affirmation, repetition, contagion.' The sermons of revivalist preachers usually consist of the affirmation of one or two truths strongly expressed, and their constant repetition. They choose hymns whose choruses are of value because they repeat a phrase over and over again. In this way the field of consciousness is narrowed for the listeners, and one thought may occupy the mind, and gain control of the motor-centres, apart from the will. Then the influence of the crowd does its work. In such revivals the personality of the leader is the dominant influence; he supplies the stimuli, and even if he can by no means control the results, yet he can, if he is a man of sanctified wisdom, be the mainspring of a movement which may do much good; if he is a charlatan, he can do incalculable harm.

(3) *Individual ecstasy*.—Even in ancient times we have examples of solitary ecstatics, as the Egyptian story of Wen Amon shows.[8] We know that the prophet Elisha became enthused by the influence of music (2 K 3^{15}). And in 2 Co 12 we read of 'a man in Christ,' who was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words. Now it may be argued that such ecstatics are people of an abnormal variety, that they have an exceptionally high emotional sensibility, but they cannot be dismissed so summarily.

When, for example, we study the Sufis of Islam, and some of the great Christian mystics, we soon come to recognize that certain facts stand out clearly. The mystics' great claim is the immediacy of their awareness of God. But the mystical life has to be cultivated, and ecstasy is a stage on the journey which leads to the complete unification of the worshipper with God. The ecstatic experiences of the great mystics may not be of a demonstrative sort at all. They may be quiet and contemplative, but none the less real; and they occur not usually at the beginning of the religious life, but at a developed stage of it.[1]

---

[1] 1 S 9; cf. 1 S 19^{20-24}.

[2] Euripides, *Bacchae*.

[3] Hecker, *Epidemics of the Middle Ages*, 117.

[4] Hecker, *op. cit.* 87 f.

[5] Starbuck, *The Psychology of Religion*, 168.

[6] Wesley's *Journal*, ii. 203 f.

[7] *Psychology of the Methodist Revival*, 131.

[8] Cf. 'The Voyage of Wen Amon,' in Erman's *Literature of Ancient Egypt*.

Such is a brief survey of various types of ecstasy. Let us try to arrive at an estimate of their religious value. Now we must first of all recognize that such ecstatic experience is often pleasant, and an intense craving for it has often been felt by a devotee.[2] And the state of ecstasy has often been sought as a pleasurable experience, as an end in itself, whose good is in its being experienced, and not in any results it may produce in the lives of the participants. And we bear in mind that the judgment has often been passed that collective ecstasy is a phenomenon which occurs at an early stage of religious development, and among primitive or uneducated people. We are in a position now to produce certain arguments in favour of that judgment.

(*a*) We have seen that the way is prepared for the experience of ecstasy by an individual within a group, when by the influence of rhythmic movements, of music, and other agents the inhibitions to emotion, action, and belief are relaxed in him, and one dominant idea takes possession of his mind, to the exclusion of all else. Naturally, in the case of an educated person, the rational and critical faculty will not so readily be lulled into quiescence, the field of consciousness will not so readily be narrowed, as in the case of an uneducated person. He will for a much longer time maintain his independence of mind against the influence of a crowd.

(*b*) We have quoted cases where a pre-condition to ecstasy was the possession on the part of the individual coming into contact with the group, of a fear or illusion which might be quite irrational, but had never been banished from the mind. And, of course, we cannot deny that such irrational fears and obsessions are commonest among uneducated people.

(*c*) It is a notable fact that the manifestations of ecstatic experience of a highly demonstrative sort which accompanied Wesley's preaching took place in two localities in particular, namely, around Bristol and Newcastle. And Wesley himself says that the population of these districts was among the most degraded and the most ignorant in all England.[3]

The question that confronts us now is this: 'Is there any religious value in such ecstatic experiences? Or are they merely pleasant, and desired as an end in themselves? Often the value of the experience must depend upon the nature of the stimuli that have been used to induce it, and even more upon the mind-content of the experients. Where the former are dancing or drugs or music, and the experients are rude and uneducated, the ecstatic experience can be nothing but an emotional disturbance, which in its effects is definitely demoralizing. We must, however, make an exception in the case of that collective ecstasy which is induced in a group by a leader. The wise leader does not only try to play upon the emotions; he endeavours to convince the mind and to awaken the conscience. He affirms truths with persistency, so that in this case the stimuli to the ecstatic experience are different, are so different as to demand special treatment. The attention of an individual may be gained in the first instance by the fact that truths, more or less known to him, are presented in a new way and with a compelling power, so that he is made to think. Thought may afford cause for apprehension and disquiet; the energy of the leader's tones may make delay impossible, and so by the ministry of music and by the influence of the example of others in the group the individual is led on. But owing to the nature of the stimuli which have been used, ecstatic experience so induced may have a noetic quality, and so have real religious value. But that experience will be made fully fruitful in the life of the experient only when the will confirms the action which was taken during the period of emotional and mental stress, and an educative ministry follows. Therefore, we are led to conclude that, whereas a religious revival, generated by a shallow, scalp-hunting emotionalist, may mean only a temporary, and oftentimes pernicious, troubling of the waters of the religious life, yet one which is directed by a leader who is sincere and who knows Him whom he has believed, can issue in great good and spiritual gain for many.

When we pass to consider the religious value of ecstasy as it is found in the lives of the great mystics, *i.e.* individual ecstasy, we note certain facts to begin with:

(*a*) There is not here any influence from a group or from a group-leader.

(*b*) This type of ecstasy is a stage on the mystic path. Before he reaches it, the individual has had a long training in discipline, and has meditated much on the nature and the works of God. Thus the experience comes to those who are prepared for it, so that the dangers of that collective ecstasy induced in a group of uneducated people are not here present.[1]

---

[1] Cf. Dr. Rufus Jones in *Psychology and the Church*, 70.

[2] Cf. *American Journal of Psychology*, xxviii. 584.

[3] *Psychology of the Methodist Revival*, 128.

(*c*) We have already stressed the importance of the nature of the stimuli to ecstasy. Here these are such as have, in the lives of former experients, proved valid and trustworthy.

It is, therefore, with a degree of confidence that we go forward to the attempt to judge the religious value of individual ecstasy. Let us note here and now the individual mystic's own description of his experience. During the experience his awareness of God is so immediate, that, reflecting on it afterwards, he is moved to say: 'God and I were one.' The results for him are an unshakable assurance of God's being and an ineffable joy, which have, or may have, great value for the religious life.

But one big question at once emerges. Do such ecstatic experiences—which, in the case of the individual, are more often quiet and passive than demonstrative—give to the experient not only an assurance of God's being, but a revelation of His nature? That is a question which it is extremely difficult to answer. Only the mystic himself can supply the main evidence which must be examined and used in coming to a finding, and he is not always able to supply it. Pratt sets forth in this connexion quite a definite conclusion: 'Mysticism is in part emotional, in part ideational and cognitive. . . . Feeling there is, usually in great richness; but this feeling is invariably crystallized about some central idea, some intellectual certainty, which comes to the mystic as a revelation of truth, and which he usually has no difficulty in defining and communicating.'[2] But the final part of that conclusion at least is very questionable. St. Teresa always protested against being asked to describe such experiences: '"I would not, and I could not, tell all," she would say, "One's innermost thoughts cannot be translated into earthly words without instantly losing their deep and heavenly meaning."'[3] And St. John of the Cross and the Sadhu Sundar Singh express themselves to the same effect.[4] In the case of many of the great mystics their ecstatic or mystical experiences are not communicable, and they have no direct social value. The real value of them is for the experient alone. The influence he exerts upon the community is not that of illuminating words, but the witness of a radiant countenance, and of a joyfully peaceful life, which proclaim the reality of the spiritual experiences. The experients become energized by the Spirit of God. But the question must now be asked: What place do such ecstatic or mystical experiences occupy in the lives of the great mystics? At once we come face to face with a great distinction. On the one hand, there are those who have travelled the mystic way, who are 'in Christ,' and who deliberately seek ecstatic experience as an end in itself. They abstract themselves from the world of men, with all its needs, and, remaining at the shrine, they cultivate their souls. Theirs is a self-centred discipline, which is open to condemnation; it is utterly regardless of the missionary aspect of religion. But on the other hand, there are those who seek ecstatic experience, in order that they may arrive at a new appreciation of spiritual truths, and communicate the result to their fellow-men. But do not those who, by searching, try to find out God, dispense with the Incarnation, and forget that their primary duty as Christians is to proclaim the riches of God in Jesus Christ? Some may answer that they do not. So far from neglecting the revelation which is in Jesus Christ, they live by it; and their sole purpose in seeking ecstatic experience is the hope that thereby some of the great truths taught by Jesus Christ may come home to them with compelling power, so that they shall subsequently be able to proclaim them to men with deeper insight into their meaning, and with greater authority.[5]

But even if pure and worthy motives can be put forward for seeking ecstatic experience, nevertheless we must remember that some of the great mystics warned their disciples against such a practice. St. Paul was compelled to reprove the Corinthian Church because of the strife and contention which had been aroused in it by the unseemly conduct of those who claimed that they had had ecstatic experiences, and babbled incoherently in an attempt to communicate what they had seen to others.[6] And we have sufficient evidence to warrant us in believing that St. Paul rejoiced much more to know the power of Christ in the everyday experiences of life than to be received up in spirit into the third heaven, and to hear unspeakable words which it is not possible for a man to utter.[7] And the Sadhu Sundar Singh, when asked if he would recommend the ordinary Christian to try to attain to ecstatic experiences, said: 'I never try to go into ecstasy; nor do I advise other people to try. It is a gift to be accepted, but not to be sought. Prayer is for every man, and so is meditation. If it is God's will that he go further, God will lead him that way.'[1] Many may not be led further of God, but they can, by God's grace, become men in Christ; they may not, in the awful hush of a visionary hour, come into the presence of the *mysterium tremendum*, but they can know the power of God in the experiences of common day.

---

[1] Jones, *Spiritual Energies*, 143.

[2] *The Religious Consciousness*, 348.

[3] Sir Francis Younghusband, *Modern Mystics*, 163.

[4] Cf. L. W. Grensted, *Psychology and God*, 203, and Streeter and Appasamy, *The Sadhu*, 140 f.

[5] Cf. Sir Mohammad Iqbal, *Religious Thought in Islam*, 118.

[6] 1 Co 14$^{4.19.23.24}$.

[7] 2 Co 12$^{1-7}$; cf. Gal 2^{20}.

---

[1] Streeter and Appasamy, *The Sadhu*, 109, 150.

Literature.

THE KINGDOM, THE SON OF MAN, AND THE LORD'S SUPPER.

RUDOLF OTTO'S *Reich Gottes und Menschensohn* (1934) has already influenced deeply some of our New Testament scholars, and now that it has been translated into English under the title, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man* (Lutterworth Press; 15s. net), by Floyd V. Filson and Professor Bertram Lee Woolf, it may safely be prophesied that its repercussions will be even more far-reaching.

The first part of Book I. traces the antecedents of the idea of the kingdom of God as far back as the prehistoric period of Aryan religion; the second part discusses the kingdom as Jesus preached it; and the third compares the original element in His teaching with the message and person of John the Baptist. Jesus, Otto maintains, first worked as a disciple of the Baptist, but later abandoned Baptism and proclaimed a kingdom which was actually breaking in upon the world in Himself and His mighty works. The fourth section supplies the necessary detailed examination of sayings and parables, and, in particular, contains a most valuable exposition of such key passages as Mt 12^{25-9} 11^{12}, Mk 4^{26-9}, and Lk $17^{20f.}$.

In Book II. the discussion is extended to the idea of the Son of Man in relation to the kingdom, and includes a careful study of the doctrine of the Son of Man in the Book of Enoch, of the Messianic utterances of Jesus, and of those sayings of His which introduce the thought of suffering and death. There is a particularly interesting note on the meaning of λύτρον which is sure to arouse interest, and perhaps controversy. Book III. treats the question of Christ's Last Supper as the consecration of the disciples for entrance into the kingdom of God; and Book IV. discusses the Kingdom and the Charisma, and seeks to present Jesus as a 'Charismatic Person.' It is in this last section that the argument of the book is most open to question, but it contains valuable sections on such themes as Healing and Exorcism, Charismatic Preaching, the Charisma of Prophecy, and Charismatic Apparitio as illustrated by Christ's Walking on the Sea. The point for doubt is whether in this section of the work an adequate Christology is found, which is capable of supporting the claims made in Books I.–III. Since this suggestive volume is sure to be widely read and debated, it is perhaps desirable to add that it rests on a very doubtful foundation in respect of the literary criticism of the Gospels. It is greatly to be regretted that Otto, whose distinctive work lay in the fields of Comparative Religion, should have accepted the scholarly, but unsatisfactory views of W. Bussmann, instead of the generally received Two Document Hypothesis. Happily, this disability does not seriously mar the work of exposition or undermine the main contentions of the book. It leads, however, to a one-sided treatment of the narratives of the Last Supper in Book III.

There can be no doubt that Otto's volume is one of the big books of the decade, since it leads the reader to the central questions of New Testament Theology. In view of the lamented author's comparatively recent death, it comes to us as a kind of legacy, different as it is in many respects from his well-known earlier work, 'The Idea of the Holy.' Whether the later work will exert the same influence upon contemporary thought, we cannot tell; but it certainly has the same atmosphere of fascination and sets the mind racing in the most fruitful directions.

THE QUR'ĀN.

The Rev. Richard Bell, B.D., D.D., has made a notable contribution to Islamic studies in *The Qur'ān, Translated with a Critical Re-arrangement of the Surahs*, Vol. I. (T. & T. Clark; 12s. 6d. net). This volume contains a translation of the first twenty-four surahs of the Qur'ān, but it is much more than a mere translation. Dr. Bell works on the hypothesis that the present form of the Qur'ān rests upon a careful reproduction of a confusion of written documents, a hypothesis for which he has good authority in the Muslim tradition, and attempts to sort out the various elements which go to the making of the surahs. In his Preface he says, 'All the possibilities of confusion in written documents have had to be considered—corrections, interlinear additions, additions on the margin, deletions and substitutions, pieces cut off from a passage and wrongly placed, passages written on the back of others and then read continuously, front and back following each other.' It is a tremendous task undertaken with distinction.

The surahs are given in their usual order, but where passages are considered to represent a working-over of material already given, parallel columns are used. Dr. Bell has thus ingeniously arranged his material, so that one can turn at once to any particular passage and at the same time note its relationship to other parts of the surah. Each surah is prefaced by notes on its structure and suggested dates for its various elements, and in the translation each passage has a brief explanatory heading. The work will arouse great interest among scholars; for while it is generally recognized, even by Muslim commentators, that surahs contain elements belonging to different periods, no such thoroughgoing attempt to unravel the elements has ever been made before.

The quality of the translation is good and accurate. Dr. Bell has succeeded in giving his translation a flavour of the original, at the same time using a natural English idiom. Here and there one meets a divergence from the usual translation, as an example of which Surah xi. 108 may be quoted. Dr. Bell translates thus, 'They are in the Fire, which for them pants and roars.' Rodwell's version is, 'Their place the Fire! therein shall they sigh and bemoan them.' Other translators, following the lines suggested by the Muslim commentator Baidāwī, give similar translations; yet the Arabic words can bear the meaning Dr. Bell gives them, and there can be no question about the vividness of his rendering.

The only regret one may express is that Dr. Bell has found it necessary, owing to the cost of printing, to suppress the bulk of his notes. To enable scholars to criticise adequately the method of separating the various elements in the Qur'ān text, fuller notes are greatly to be desired; and the work is of such importance that some generous patron, or some fund, ought to undertake the cost of the entire publication, in order that students of Islam may have a full statement of Dr. Bell's researches put before them. A notable advance in Qur'ānic studies has been made, and the second volume will be eagerly awaited.

DR. JOHN DONNE.

An able and industrious Indian student, Mr. Itrat Husain, M.A., Ph.D., has issued a detailed examination of *The Dogmatic and Mystical Theology of John Donne* (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d. net). Sir Herbert J. C. Grierson explains in the Preface that in the course of a methodical study of the English religious poetry of the seventeenth century Dr. Husain prepared an anthology or index of Donne's pronouncements on various Christian dogmas, and that thereafter he undertook to examine Donne's theological position, being struck by Donne's sincerity and orthodoxy (both of which have been called in question). The result is before us in a scholarly work which claims to be the first attempt to present its subject in a systematic manner.

Sir Herbert J. C. Grierson does not seem to be so convinced of Donne's sincerity as Dr. Husain is: 'The feeling one gets is that of acquiescence rather than of passionate conviction attained after much doubt and uncertainty.' But a perusal of Dr. Husain's volume leaves little or no doubt of Donne's orthodoxy. In some places, indeed, he may appear to be ultra-orthodox; as, for example, where he says that when God created the lower creatures He did it by His word, but that when He created man He did it also through consultation. That is to say, the creation of man was the work of the Trinity: 'But when God came to the best of his creatures, to Man, Man was not only made *in Verbo*, as the rest were, by speaking a word, but by consultation, by a conference, by a counsel, *faciamus hominem, let us make Man*; there is a more express manifestation of divers persons speaking together, of a concurrence of the Trinity.'

It was not Donne's aim, like Hooker's, to make a comprehensive survey of the Anglican theology. Accordingly, Dr. Husain had to piece together the references dispersed through the whole body of the sermons. Perhaps he might have done so in a way more in keeping with the usual logical order and method of Christian theology, but his achievement remains notable and valuable.

He first deals with Donne's defence of the Anglican Church against the Puritans and the Papists, then with certain theological views held by Donne, especially on the sacraments, and after that with his systematic theology in general. The whole finishes with a brief consideration of Donne's mystical theology, treated under the heads of prayer, the mystical life, mortification, illumination, Christ, and the mystical union.

STUDIES IN ISLAM AND JUDAISM.

Under the title, *Studies in Islam and Judaism*, the Yale University Press has published a handsome volume giving the Arabic original of Ibn Shâhîn's Book of Comfort, known as the 'Ḥibbûr Yaphê of R. Nissîm b. Ya'aqobh,' edited from the unique manuscript by Julian Obermann (New Haven; $15). There are 183 pages of Arabic text with copious footnotes, 156 plates containing a photographic reproduction of the entire MS., a brief Foreword, and 44 pages providing technical aids, indexes, and *Addenda et Corrigenda*. The editor intends to follow this work, which is a monument of industry, with an Introduction which will discuss problems relating to the text-edition, and one hopes that a translation will also be provided.

The MS. is written in Hebrew characters and presents many difficulties of decipherment. As the editor remarks, the philological study of Judæo-Arabic is still in its infancy, and therefore many knotty problems arise. A few of the folios are blurred and stained, but the bulk of the MS. is remarkably clear. Dr. Obermann is to be congratulated on the success with which he has edited a difficult text.

The author of the book was a Jewish scholar who lived in Qairawan in the eleventh century. While Arabists will find this work to be of great philological interest, its chief significance lies in the fact that it presents us with a Jewish example of a branch of Arabic literature known as *Al-faraj baʿd al-shidda* (relief after distress). Such works consist of stories relating how God has delivered righteous people from their trials. The present work begins in the usual style, addressing a friend who has asked for some information on the subject, and expressing readiness to respond to his request. Then follows a series of stories to show how God delivers the righteous. The peculiar interest of this work is that its sources are Jewish, mainly Rabbinic, unlike other Arabic works on the subject which naturally draw their material from Muslim sources. In the footnotes the editor gives references to the sources quoted. It can readily be understood that this book contains valuable material for the study of folklore, mediæval theology, Rabbinical Judaism, and the history of the interrelations between Judaism and Islam. But a translation is essential if the wealth of material is to be made available to the student who is unacquainted with Arabic.

THE FOCUS OF BELIEF.

In the work of this title the Rev. A. R. Whately, M.A., D.D., has made a notable contribution to English theological literature (Cambridge University Press; 8s. 6d. net). It is the product of many years' study and reflection. Horace's famous advice to would-be authors, 'Keep your piece nine years' has obvious sense; but it sometimes involves a drawback; so familiar does the writer become with his own thought-process that he is apt to compress, giving his results without due explication of how he reached them. We are not sure to what extent it is this or a desire to keep his book within moderate limits that has influenced Dr. Whately; but certainly not a few passages would have been better of expansion. It is a very able work, but it is not altogether easy to read. One must read and ponder very slowly; if that is done one gets a growing sense of being in the hands of a master.

Dr. Whately owes much to Husserl and J. W. Dunne, and has felt the stimulus of the Barthians, although he has some cogent criticism of them. His main aim is to find some focus round which the whole system of Christian Doctrine may be arranged in concentric circles; only so can any advance be made towards a satisfying and unifying theology. His opening chapters deal with Faith and for that discussion alone the book is valuable. Faith, he points out, is from its inception the acceptance not of an opinion but of a certitude. We do not 'prove' God and the gospel, we accept them. Then he proceeds to discuss the truth and the content of the idea of God, then sin and salvation, then the Atonement, then the credal structure (Incarnation, Resurrection and Ascension, the Holy Spirit, the Trinity), and lastly, Eschatology. Each of those chapters is full of suggestiveness, and one gets the impression of a really massive structure.

The focal point round which all our theological thinking should gather is Redemption, that is the heart of the revelation of God. The Christian Faith consists of a mass of related truths, and Redemption is central to all.

DR. MOFFATT'S EARLY CHURCH HISTORY.

With the publication of this book we may say that Dr. Moffatt has enriched the literature of practically every branch of the theological curriculum. While we think his greatest renown undoubtedly lies in the field of New Testament studies, it must be remembered that for many years back he has been teaching Church History. It was in every way desirable that his large public should have some permanent record of his prowess in that Department. His book, published under the auspices of the London Theological Library, is entitled *The First Five Centuries of the Church* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). It is not a large volume. It runs to no more than two hundred and fifty-one pages, the last forty-five of which are occupied with a bibliography. What can one make of the history of five centuries in so limited a space? Who but Dr. Moffatt could be trusted to make anything worth while? We have had a superfluity of small books on the earliest days of Christianity. But Dr. Moffatt has the faculty of being different. The book consists of five chapters, each dealing with one century; and it is pointed out that if we take the centuries in view as extending from thirty to one hundred and thirty, and so on, we do get real epochs, in each of which one name stands out pre-eminent. In each chapter we get first a catalogue of the important happenings both in the Church and in the world. There follows in each case a masterly exposition of the significance of events for the main line of the Church's expansion and development.

The book will not serve for a text-book of Church History; but the student will find it valuable as an introduction to his more detailed study; while the general reader will find it excellent as a revelation of how the Church fared, the problems that faced her, and the causes that shaped her development.

The bibliography is very full and is carefully classified. Even helpful fiction and poems are not forgotten. Opinions may vary as to their suitability for inclusion; but as we have said, Dr. Moffatt must be allowed to do things differently. That this volume will be among those for which he will be best remembered, we are not prepared to say; but we are glad to have it.

INDIAN AND WESTERN PHILOSOPHY.

The sub-title of *Indian and Western Philosophy*, by Miss Betty Heimann, Ph.D. (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net)—'A Study in Contrasts'—is an indication of its character. According to the author, two categories, namely, the cosmical and the anthropological, are fundamental in religious and philosophical thinking, and the one indicates a typically Indian and the other a typically Western attitude. Emphasis upon an antithesis at the beginning of a book may be conducive to clearness of exposition, but it may also become too dominant, and Dr. Heimann, in her anxiety to avoid false analogies, occasionally falls a victim to forced contrasts which interfere with the fairness of her judgments. Yet this is a fresh and challenging book, containing much originality of thought and some masterly expositions of difficult Indian doctrines, combined with not irrelevant exposures of misleading *clichés*. We have rarely come across so illuminating a treatment of the doctrines of *Māyā* and *Nirvāna*, in the elucidation of which Dr. Heimann makes most skilful use of her philological knowledge. Yet even here, just when we are surrendering ourselves to the pleasure of a purely objective treatment, polemic enters, and the evidence which she has so painstakingly collected and so cleverly stated, is forced into the straitjacket of her thesis. Dr. Heimann is determined to discredit unproved assumptions, but occasionally assumes too easily that the assumptions of which she disapproves are themselves unproved.

At an early stage, according to her, Western thought (and in 'Western' she includes, geographically and historically, the Near East) made the transition from the older cosmic outlook to the anthropological attitude. Since the time of the Sophists Western devotion to the principle of man as the measure of all things, has incapacitated Western philosophers for a proper appreciation of Indian thought. Those especially who have sought to find in Indian speculation anticipations of the doctrines of the unity and personality of God, have gone woefully far astray. The fundamental Indian belief, particularly, but by no means only in its primitive stages, is the powerlessness of man in the grasp of natural forces, and the influence of an environment of tropical exuberance (a favourite *deus ex machina* conception of the author's) is in favour of plurality rather than unity. She holds that there is no superimposed order or plan, no personal God who controls the cosmic order. The gods themselves are subject to quick changes of form, as empirical manifestations of the ever productive cosmic energy. 'In India, not singleness, but plurality and manifoldness of form and type have been at every period, from early Kathenotheism to the latest conceptions of divine duality or polarity the adequate expressions of God-nature.' God, in the sense of a spiritual principle, can never be almighty. The laws of *Karma* and Reincarnation are never supreme. They come into existence *along with* cosmic happenings, and are in no sense prior to, or originative of, these. They are intelligible only as generalizations manifested through the infinite diversity of cosmic phenomena.

Dr. Heimann goes even further than this in her opposition to current notions of Indian idealism. For her the basic Indian idea is the equal valuation of matter and mind, with, indeed, a bias in favour of 'the supremacy of the materialistic chaotic principle,' although, of course—in order to avoid one of those terrible 'false analogies'—she cannot allow that Indian thought ever exhibits a purely materialistic doctrine. But her exposition causes Indian philosophers to tremble on the very verge of this latter, and it is against idealism that she directs the full force of her polemic. Schopenhauer and Deussen are the arch-transgressors in the misleading of Western thought, and all other Western interpreters have followed them like sheep. Dr. Heimann, it may be remarked, has evidently not read several recent important books upon Indian philosophy, in which Deussen's arguments are seriously controverted, and a position as regards the interpretation of *Māyā* and *Nirvāna* is taken up which is not unlike her own, although it does not go to the same extreme of anti-idealism. Surely it is rather too much to ask us to believe that 'with the merely Abstract the Indian mind never concerns itself,' unless indeed by 'abstract' she means the merely negative, in which case her statement might be justifiable. But her own conception of what is meant by idealism is decidedly hazy, and consequently her attack upon the possibility of an idealistic interpretation of Indian thought is constantly shifting its ground. Even if the Indian attitude is *not* negative idealism, this does not disprove its idealism in other—and more usual—senses of the term. And, finally, it seems almost inconceivable that Rāmānuja, who would have approved of her interpretation of *Māyā*, is given no consideration at all in what purports to be a balanced survey of Indian literature.

Her analysis of Indian ethics is accurate, if slightly uninspiring; and she finds her way with great success through some of the intricacies of Indian logic. Her general conclusions are by no means favourable to those who hope to find signs of a *rapprochement* between Indian and Western thought, or who, in particular, think they can discover in Indian religious literature some anticipatory friendliness to Christian ideas. But neither can any opposition arise out of her new and naturalistic interpretation of Indian thought; for, still, even in the matter of non-rationality in its modern form, Indian and Western thought move on entirely different planes, and there can be neither amalgamation nor collision. The utmost she allows us to hope for is a slight amount of mutual collaboration and reciprocal enrichment through the discovery of how greatly we differ. But, however vehemently we may disagree with its conclusions, the book, just because it presents so many fresh points of view, is one of the most valuable amongst recent publications on the subject.

We may naturally expect a considerable number of books on the English Bible in the near future, and it is a pleasure to note an interesting volume from America—*The Bible and its Literary Associations*, by Miss Margaret B. Crook and others (Abingdon Press; $2.50). Most of the contributors are women, and each can lay claim to expert knowledge of the field in which she writes, though, from time to time, a statement seems to need correction or revision. Miss Crook herself is the editor, and handles the Biblical literature; her chapters by themselves would form an admirable little 'Introduction.' Her field is well known, but other contributors take us over ground less familiar to the average Bible student. Thus we have instructive chapters on the Gothic Bible, the Bible in the Roman world of Augustine's day, and the pre-Reformation versions in England and Germany. It is especially interesting to note that the absence of vernacular translations did not mean unfamiliarity with the Bible story, for parts of it were constantly presented to the public in other forms, under the guise of poetry or of drama. Of peculiar interest are the chapters dealing with the influence of the Bible on other forms of literature—Milton's poetry, the English drama, the writings of De Quincey and of Thomas Hardy. Naturally a careful selection has necessarily been made from among the many subjects which could have been included. While we recognize the inevitable limitations of such a book, we cannot but regret the impossibility of including the Syriac among the ancient versions described and discussed, and of the French among the modern translations. In the last chapter, too, the choice of the two English writers appears somewhat arbitrary; was either De Quincey or Hardy more familiar with the Bible than was Kipling? But in such a book as this we cannot dictate to the writers; they have made their choice and done their work extraordinarily well, for every chapter is well written, illuminating, and instructive.

Twenty Centuries of Jewish Thought, by Dr. Adolph Lichtigfeld (Beck; 2s. 6d. net), is an attempt to give the reader a comprehensive idea of the notable achievements of Judaism since the end of the second Temple. Dr. Lichtigfeld has divided his material into subjects, under such heads as 'God and the World,' 'The Law,' 'Of Man's Duty in the World.' It is confessedly an anthology, and consists mainly of quotations from Jewish authors, beginning with the Bible itself, and including not a few modern leaders of Jewish thought. Every age is represented, and the living authors cited include representatives both of the orthodox and the liberal wings. But, in spite of the excellence of the matter cited, and of Dr. Lichtigfeld's own occasional contributions, apparently intended to give the quotations their proper setting in his scheme, the work has an appearance of scrappiness, and it is difficult to get a connected thread running through it. This is probably the fault of the method, and the reader who will take the trouble to go through the volume carefully will often come across passages of great beauty and value.

The sufferings of the Jews have been a permanent element in the history of Europe for nearly two thousand years. There have been places in which they have been suffered to dwell unmolested, and sometimes even honoured for longer or shorter periods, but everywhere, except in the British Commonwealth and in the United States, these intervals of comparative peace have ended in persecution. One of the most notable instances in which Israel has had rest is to be found in Spain during the centuries which followed the Muslim conquests. Here, despite intervals of unpopularity and occasional persecution, they flourished till the end of the fifteenth century. In *Isaac Abravanel*: Six Lectures by Paul Goodman, I. G. Llubera, M. Gaster, L. Rabinowitz, L. Strauss, and A. R. Milburn, edited by Professor J. B. Trend, M.A., and H. M. J. Loewe, M.A. (Cambridge University Press; 7s. 6d. net), half a dozen experts have given us a picture of a man who was an outstanding figure of the age when Judaism was proscribed in Portugal and Spain. He 'lived through the Renaissance, the invention of printing, the fall of Constantinople, the birth-pangs of the Reformation, the discovery of America, and the opening of the sea-route to India.' He was a great financier and the favourite of kings, yet driven from one country to another by passionate outbreaks of anti-Jewish fanaticism. His was one of the most brilliant minds of a brilliant age, and he had outstanding abilities as an exegete and as a philosopher. The authors of this volume have done their work well, and have given us a stereoscopic picture of this many-sided man, and of the age in which he lived.

Mr. Anthony Lincoln has published his Prince Consort Prize Essay of 1934 under the title, *Some Political and Social Ideas of English Dissent*, 1763–1800 (Cambridge University Press; 8s. 6d. net). By the Dissenters we are to understand Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Baptists who struggled to maintain themselves between the Church of England and the Methodists. In the years under review they laboured for the abolition of the Test Act with all the civil disabilities involved. They were very optimistic. The spirit of the Age seemed to be favourable. But the close of the eighteenth century saw them disillusioned and defeated. Against them stood their past history; they were the sons of the regicides. Against them, too, stood their sympathies with the French Revolution. Against them, too, was their lack of unity. What they contended for, however, was in due time to bear fruit. The significance of their long conflict was that from a religious origin views as to the natural rights of man were gradually formulated as a political principle. All this is carefully worked out and proved in Mr. Lincoln's admirable Essay which is of great merit as expounding an interesting and important chapter in the history of political philosophy.

We have received *A Critical Study of Primitive Liturgies*, by Mr. K. N. Daniel (C.M.S. Press, Kottayam). Mr. Daniel very kindly sent us the book for review, but we do not know whether it be on sale in this country, or if so, at what price. The title is rather ambitious for so small a book. As a matter of fact, Mr. Daniel limits his first-hand study to Jacobite liturgies. He has examined many such and proves what wide variety exists among them. The Jacobite Church has never standardized its liturgy, so there is no limit to the possibility of differences in the forms actually used in particular churches. That is consistent with the existence of strong family resemblances. Mr. Daniel, however, has evidently studied the work of liturgiologists who deal with the great Liturgies, and from time to time illustrates or supports his findings from them. His point is that from a simple and spiritual intention, liturgies gradually became more and more 'sacramental.' Thus the original Epiklesis, a prayer for the Spirit on the worshippers, became an invocation of the Spirit on the elements. We are grateful for the translation of so many prayers from the ancient and more modern Jacobite liturgies.

Vladimir Solovyev, who has been called 'the Russian Newman' and 'the Russian von Hügel' wrote 'Religioznya Osnovy Zhisni' ('The Spiritual Foundations of Life') so long ago as 1882–84. That work is regarded as 'the clearest and most convenient account of Solovyev's principles and teaching.' From a French version of it Mr. Donald Attwater has given us an English translation with the title *God, Man, and the Church* (James Clarke; 5s. net). The main idea of the book can be expressed very briefly. Man needs God but without God manifest in Christ we should not know God as a living reality. But Christ, too, must be to us more than a historical figure; He must be revealed in the present as well as in the past. 'Christ is shown to us as a living reality independent of our limited personality by the Church.' 'Those who think they can dispense with any intermediary and obtain personally a full and definite revelation of Christ are certainly not yet ripe for that revelation; what they take to be Christ are the fantasies of their own imagination.' 'It is the office of the Church to sanctify and with the help of the Christian State to transfigure the earthly life of man and of society.' This is worked out in a series of chapters each of which is rich in thought and suggestiveness. We are glad to have in our language such a book by so interesting a writer.

There is very sound Church History in biographical form in *Early Light-Bearers of Scotland*, stories of Scotland's saints told by Miss Elizabeth W. Grierson (James Clarke; 6s. net). It is a good fat book, well illustrated, and written in a simple style that will suit old and young alike. We begin, of course, with St. Ninian and end with St. Magnus of Orkney, taking in by the way saints well known like Patrick and very little known like Prostan, Palladius, Boisil, and Ebba. The little-known ones will stir your curiosity, and you will be glad to hear again about the great light-bearers like St. Serf, St. Kentigern, and St. Cuthbert. This is a most interesting introduction to the religious story of Scotland.

The Road That Was Made (James Clarke; 5s. net), by Mr. L. Firman-Edwards, B.A., M.D. (Cantab.), is a fresh and popular exposition of the Christian faith in some of its fundamental articles by a thoughtful and cultured layman. The standpoint is Anglican or, more precisely, Anglo-Catholic. We commend the volume to preachers and others who would like to see Christian doctrines expounded on unconventional lines. But it is perhaps somewhat pretentious on Dr. Firman-Edwards' part to describe his work as a philosophical study of the nature of reality. It does indeed face the question of reality in its opening pages, in discussions that are clear and interesting, but it is chiefly concerned, as we have already indicated, with the presentation of fundamental Catholic doctrine.

We observe that Dr. Firman-Edwards is, like Mr. J. B. Priestley, attracted by the speculations of Mr. J. W. Dunne, who in his book, 'An Experiment in Time,' appears to claim to have established on rational grounds the truth of personal immortality.

Under the title *Is Not This the Son of Joseph?* (James Clarke; 3s. 6d. net) Dr. Thomas Walker discusses the early narratives in the First and Third Gospels. He gives a good deal of his space to a discussion of the Virgin Birth, and comes to the conclusion that the doctrine was foisted on the gospel narrative by the dogma of a later age. In their original form, he believes, both Gospels presented Jesus as the son of Joseph. As he points out, to the Hebrew mind, every birth involves divine co-operation, and the phrase 'conceived of the Holy Spirit' would not necessarily, or even probably, involve miraculous conception to the mind of either evangelist. Non-Jewish Christians, however, brought up in another atmosphere of thought, would interpret the phrase differently. Doubts as to the legitimacy of Jesus would be raised by the enemies of Christianity, and the non-Jewish mind would feel compelled to seek an answer to their attacks, finding it in a miraculous conception. For readers to whom the doctrine of the Virgin Birth is a stumbling-block, Dr. Walker's statement of his case may be really helpful, for it is based on sound knowledge of the Hebrew mind, and skilfully presented. Even readers who prefer not to accept his conclusion will find his work interesting and stimulating.

That there is to-day a perceptible swing of the pendulum away from a mechanistic towards a more spiritual view of the world can hardly be denied. How far the movement may go and how long it may persist is another matter. In *The Pendulum Swings Back*, by Mr. Marvin M. Black

(Cokesbury Press; $2.00) we have an exposition of this movement as it manifests itself in the various departments of science. The writer covers a very wide, perhaps too wide a field. Beginning with physics and biology, he pursues his thesis through psychology, psychic research, and contemporary medicine to social philosophy and cultural anthropology. As a consequence, the discussion in each department is brief and at times scrappy. The writer, who has had much journalistic experience, writes in a clear and decisive, and at times a provocative style. He assumes throughout the attitude of an advocate pleading his case, rather than a judge nicely balancing the evidence. All the same he has brought together an impressive body of testimony from many and far-distant quarters in support of a spiritual view of the world.

The Drummond Tract Depot, Stirling, whose tracts in recent years have attained so remarkable a degree of excellence, has begun to issue threepenny booklets on religious and theological topics. The one before us, the fifth of the series, is *The Christian Doctrine of the Trinity*, by Professor J. M. Shaw, D.D. It is extraordinarily well done, a plain and simple treatment of a great Christian doctrine such as the man in the street may reasonably be expected to follow. It is specially excellent in making clear that the doctrine of the Trinity is no mere philosophical theory or gratuitous speculation but is 'a brief comprehensive summing up of the Christian conception of God, and is the form under which we must think of Him if we are to be true to the distinctive features of Christian revelation and experience.'

Sunshine in the Valley, by Mr. H. E. Hewitt (Drummond Tract Depot, Stirling; 9d. and 1s. 6d.), contains seven short devotional papers on themes which are fitted to bring comfort to souls in distress. It is written in a simple and pleasing style, is evidently the fruit of deep experience, and has its pages adorned by a number of helpful quotations and encouraging anecdotes. It is warmly commended in a Foreword by Mr. Hugh Redwood.

Mr. H. J. Schonfield will have many sympathizers in his wish to discover additional knowledge as to the long-lost Gospel according to the Hebrews. With that aim Mr. Schonfield has turned to a study of the satirical Jewish skit on the Gospels, the 'Toldoth Jeshu.' That curious document is obviously a caricature of so much of our Gospels; Mr. Schonfield thinks that some material in the Toldoth which cannot be traced to our Gospels may well have come from the Gospel of the Hebrews. He works this out in *According to the Hebrews* (Duckworth; 10s. 6d. net). The result is disappointing. The only additions to our knowledge of the life of Christ are a probable first arrest with a rescue by the Disciples, and a probable burial in a vegetable-garden. As to the former, we prefer the account we have of a first attempted but unfulfilled arrest; and the lettuces of the garden do not seem important. Mr. Schonfield's whole argument rests on a mass of assumptions, as he himself admits; and though they hang together, they are not convincing. Much labour has been expended, and on many subsidiary points the author is worth attention. But we fail to see that any real addition to our knowledge of 'Hebrews' has been made. The opinion is indeed confirmed that our 'Matthew' probably stands nearest 'Hebrews' and that 'Hebrews' is most deserving of the name 'Matthew'; but if we are not mistaken, that is the common view.

It is no easy task to write about the divine love, to scale the heights and sound the depths of it, and every serious writer will feel most the inadequacy of his word. But in *The Love of God*, by Mr. Bede Frost (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net), we have a book on this sublime theme which is more than ordinarily satisfying. It is at once thoughtful and devotional, doctrinal and practical, and above all, Scriptural and evangelical. The writer treats his subject under three main heads: first, the love of God as the highest expression of the divine nature; second, the outgoing of that love in creation and redemption; and third, the responsive love of God in man. All these topics are handled with great clearness and simplicity considering their depths and mystery. The writer's affinities are with the mediæval mystics and theologians, and from their writings he draws many apt illustrative quotations. It is a thought-provoking and heart-moving book.

Hanukkah: The Feast of Lights (Jewish Publication Society of America; $2.50), compiled and edited by Emily Solis-Cohen, Jr., is a collection of extracts from many sources, explaining the origin of the festival and illustrating its practice. It includes excerpts from I. and II. Maccabees, pieces from modern novels, plays, essays, poems, and a number of musical selections. There are some fine photographs of Hanukkah lamps, together with a mosaic and a fresco from Roman Imperial times. Naturally a good deal of stress is laid on the triumphs of Judas Maccabæus, but other aspects of the festival are not neglected. Falling, as it does, somewhere near the date of Christmas, it carries with it the same tone of happiness and goodwill, characteristics well brought out in this volume. While the book is intended primarily for Jews, others will find in it much to interest them.

It is generally admitted that the alphabet is not the least of the gifts made by the Semitic world to Western civilization. Details of its origin, however, are still much discussed, and we welcome the contribution made by the Rev. Abram Setsuzau Kotsuji, B.D., Th.D., a Japanese scholar with an American training. In *The Origin and Evolution of the Semitic Alphabets* (Kyo Bun Kwan, Tokyo; $15.00) we have a thorough survey of the whole field, the first to be made since the discovery of the Sinai inscription and the Ras Shamra literature. The general conclusion is that our data give us three main forms of alphabet (excluding the Ugaritian, which stands by itself)—Sinaitic, South Semitic, and Phœnician. Apparently all these spring from a common source, which can no longer accurately be located. Phœnicia, however, was probably the great distributing centre. The book (in spite of some misprints) is beautifully produced, with large clear type, handsome *format*, and numerous illustrations, most of which are taken directly from photographs and squeezes. Dr. Kotsuji's conclusions seem to be well founded and, even if they should not be finally accepted, his book is a beautiful and a useful collection of the material available.

We are glad that Dr. William McMillan's excellent book on *The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1550–1638*, which appeared in 1931, has been reprinted by the Lassodie Press in a popular edition at 3s. 6d. We trust that at the lower price this valuable work will find a new and larger public.

In introducing *Challenge: Christ or Compromise*, by Mr. M. R. Bennett (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net), the Archbishop of York imagines Middle Age and Ecclesiastical Propriety exclaiming, 'Well, well. . . . Really now. . . . Upon my word,' thus raising in the reader the expectation of something unusually exciting and arresting. As happens in such cases, this expectation is not fulfilled. The book is written in a racy and pungent way, but is in no sense revolutionary. After a glance or two at the Old Testament, and a summary review of New Testament history, the writer takes a hasty scamper down the Christian ages, pointing out some of the obvious places where the Church went wrong, flings a stone or two at the Puritans, and canters on to modern times. Here he deals with the menace of Nationalism based on force, as opposed to Christ's Kingdom of love. He finds in the Church of England, as reinvigorated by the Oxford Movement in the nineteenth century, a worthy object of his loyalty, and he utters a stirring call to the young in general and to the critics in particular to stand in and make the Church such a blessing to the land and the world as Christ means her to be.

It is a hundred and eleven years since the then Vicar of Islington started an annual Clerical Conference. The Conference has maintained its vitality for over a century and is to-day a notable gathering of Evangelicals of the Church of England. This year, very appropriately, the subject of Conference was 'the Bible—its witness in history and its relevance to-day.' Eight addresses were delivered and are now published under the title of *Written for Our Learning* (Lutterworth Press; 1s. 6d. net), with a Foreword by the Bishop of Norwich. Such topics are dealt with as God's Revelation of Himself to Man, The Bible and the Reformation, Its Influence on the English People, Its Place in the Worship of the Church. Of special interest is a paper on The Universal Appeal of the Bible by Prebendary W. Wilson Cash who writes with wide experience of the Mission Field, while an address on The Bible and Personal Religion by the Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, brought the Conference to a fitting close.

One of the wisest and most helpful books on religious teaching in the school has been written by Mr. T. F. Kinloch, the adviser on Religious Education to the Wolverhampton Education Authority—*Religious Education in Provided Schools* (Milford; 1s. net). In what is really a booklet he covers a lot of ground—the Syllabus, the Teacher, the Worship, as well as a survey of religious education in the Victorian era and at the present day. These chapters are full of insight. We get the fruits of the experience and observation of an unusually able man, whose competence is only equalled by his independence. 'Most hymns are bad,' and 'it is much more important for a boy or girl to read extracts from St. Paul's letters than it is to study the Acts of the Apostles'—these are sufficient evidence of his independence! The whole book is evidence of his competence.

Mr. J. C. Pringle is Honorary Secretary of the Metropolitan Visiting and Relief Association and of the London Association of Voluntary School Care Committee Workers, and so can speak with unimpeachable authority on the *Social Work of the London Churches* (Milford; 5s. net). The book is rightly described as 'a record and a plea.' It traces the history and development of social enterprise, and does so in most readable and instructive fashion. But the real value of the book lies in its aspect as plea. That plea is one which is fitted to touch the conscience of the churches and of Christian individuals. The spirit of parochial devotion and work needs to be revived. The hope for Society lies in the gospel, but the gospel must be presented and intelligently applied in clear view of the concrete situation. The Church must get back into living touch with the lives it would redeem. This, of course, is not said in this book for the first time; but we have seldom found it said so convincingly.

We have read Professor Georgia Harkness's book, *The Recovery of Ideals* (Scribner's; 7s. 6d. net), with great pleasure. It is not only well but frequently movingly written. Her deep earnestness and her knowledge of what she is writing about are patent. In her description of the melancholy and menacing state of a large proportion of modern youth we are entirely at one with her. True, it is American youth of whom she writes, and here and there some discount has to be made for that, all points not being quite comparable to what obtains, as yet, among ourselves. Apart from that, her diagnosis is sufficiently accurate to enlist our interest. We quite agree, too, in holding, as she does, that the root of the trouble with youth is that it has lost ideals, and that the remedy lies in the recovery of ideals. We are not so sure that she is definite enough in her treatment of how best this desirable consummation is most hopefully to be sought. Of her own religious conviction and of the value of religion to her personally the book leaves us in no doubt. What we do miss is insistence on the grim fact of the sinfulness of sin and sinful man's inability to rouse himself to love and pursue ideals. We may be doing injustice to Dr. Harkness, but our impression is that she is encouraging sinners to rouse and raise themselves, and promising them God's help if they do so.

A Little Dictionary of Bible Phrases, compiled by the Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, D.D. (S.P.C.K.; 1s. 9d., paper cover, 1s.), will be helpful to those who cannot afford a large concordance. It contains explanations of many Bible words that are not really understood because, owing to the lapse of time, their meaning has changed. 'Conversation' is an instance that occurs at once to the mind. It meant 'conduct' or 'course of life' when the Bible was translated in 1611. And there are many other cases. And there are words, like 'covenant,' the full significance of which for both Old and New Testament religion is not familiar to the ordinary reader. There is a whole page on 'covenant,' as there is on 'Jehovah,' another word that needs careful explanation. This is an interesting book to dip into, and a good companion for Bible students.

Revolutionary Religion: Christianity, Fascism and Communism, by the Rev. Roger Lloyd, Canon of Winchester (S.C.M.; 5s. net), is a book which will put new strength and hope into those who are faltering or despairing because of the present confusions of the world. Canon Lloyd does not mince matters as regards the difficulties Christianity has to face both now and in the immediate future. It is essentially a revolutionary religion, but revolutionary through the transformation of the individual, yet implicitly social, human soul, rather than through political reformism. As revolutionary in this special sense, it finds two antagonists powerfully existent—Communism and Fascism—which have resulted in an attitude to life which is opposed to every principle of Christianity. They also may claim to be religions, because they are inspired by a passionate belief in a materialistic future, a faith indeed without God, but one for which men are even willing to die, demanding in the meantime quick returns, and supported in disappointment by the fervour of their mass-convictions. They seem to succeed where Christianity seems to have failed, because men in revolt against an established order prefer their novelty to be absolutely new, and because the Church has not sufficiently shed its intellectual and social conservatism, whilst all the while the new faiths are apparently able to produce rapid results.

If we were to say that Canon Lloyd shows more ability in the analysis and criticism of Totalitarian doctrine than in the more positively constructive part of his book, we should be doing him an injustice; for his belief is that the superiority of Christianity consists very specially in its refusal to provide a cut-and-dry scheme for the immediate future. If it is to be deeply effective it must move slowly, it must share in the patience of God, and suffer over and over again the humiliation of apparent defeat. At the same time it may be permissible to say that one would have to search very far for a better explication of Totalitarianism, both Left and Right, than we find in this book.

Canon Lloyd has greater favour for Communism than for Fascism, but thinks that the former has been false to its own principles, Karl Marx having only the shadowy prestige of a saint who is 'conveniently dead.' It has set up new class distinctions and international rivalries, and, after having 'caused a greater weight of sheer human misery than any other operation which the world has ever known,' has found itself cowering under the same type of dictatorship as Fascism openly advocates. It cannot be gainsaid that both forms of state-craft illustrate the truth of Lord Acton's dictum that 'power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.'

Canon Lloyd's book should be read by all who are anxious to clarify their views as to the present world-situation and receive some guidance as to its betterment.

A book issued by the Church of Scotland Youth Committee has been reissued under the auspices of the Student Christian Movement Press—*The Making of a Christian*, by the Rev. George M. Dryburgh, M.A. (2s. 6d. net). This is a real compliment to an excellent book. It contains studies on all aspects of the Christian life, and is meant specially for Bible Classes, Fellowships, and Study Circles. The book has already been reviewed in these columns.

An excellent guide to the application of psychology to life-problems will be found in *The Treatment of Moral and Emotional Difficulties*, by Mr. Cyril H. Valentine, M.A., Ph.D., (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net). The author is Lecturer in Psychology in the Chichester Diocese, and his book is full not only of clear thinking but also of common sense. An instance of this is his insistence on the fact that psychology, by its very popularity, may become a social menace. People who have had a 'course' on psychology, or who have picked up 'unconsidered trifles' from easily-written books, may do children a great deal of harm by their prentice efforts. There is nothing of that here. The writer points out wisely that not all clergymen, for example, are fitted to be practising psychologists. Some of them are quite capable of exercising such a ministry when thoroughly trained. And there is an urgent need for them. But even so, it is necessary that they should keep in close touch with the doctor. It is equally true that not all doctors have an aptitude for psychological work, and it is a distinct weakness on their part to ignore the function of the psychologists.

These points are discussed in the course of the exposition by the author. But his main purpose is to show the methods by which the slightly abnormal personality may be led back to complete normality. The book is rich in actual examples, and the writer is very clear as to the place religion must hold in all such cures. He calls his work 'a practical guide for parsons and others,' and all parsons may gather much from its well-informed pages, for, even if they cannot become specialists, they may learn enough to become 'first-aid stations.' The book is of quite unusual value—one of the best of its kind.

The rise of Totalitarian States confronts Christians with an old problem in intensified form—the relation of Church and State or, put otherwise, the Christian faith and politics. Many good books have recently appeared dealing with the subject; it is a special pleasure to mention the distinguished contributions of Dr. J. H. Oldham. It is obvious that the churches have as yet no coherent statement to make to which all Christians would agree. The churches are well aware of that and have been in conference on the subject, and much invaluable information has been collated. In light of all that work Mr. Nils Ehrenström has written a very valuable book, translated by Miss Olive Wyon and the Rev. Denzil Patrick, under the title *Christian Faith and the Modern State, an Œcumenical Approach* (S.C.M.; 6s. net). It first explains the nature and the urgency of the problem raised for the Church by the political situation. Then, in an interesting series of chapters, it shows what, historically, have been the views of Church and State held by Roman Catholics, the Orthodox Church, Anglicans, Lutherans, and Calvinists respectively; and closes with a thought-provoking and illuminating discussion of the functions and the limits of the State. As already remarked, churches and individual Christians are still gravely perplexed and dissonant on this question. Mr. Ehrenström's book reveals their uncertainty and dissonance. At the same time, it does a great deal by its profound yet lucid explication of the problem to suggest advance towards a common view and a united policy which the churches must attain if they are not only to speak with authority in a confused world, but even to continue to exist in it.

The Christian Year in Worship.

By Evelyn Underhill, D.D., London.

It was one of the less fortunate results of the Reformation, that in the general recoil from liturgical ideals of public worship the Evangelical Churches either lost or reduced their sense of the close connexion between that worship and the great cycle of commemorations known as the Christian Year. This cycle, or 'Proper of Time,' running from Advent to Trinity Sunday, and therein recapitulating the whole drama of God's self-disclosure in Christ, gave a particular character and significance to each Sunday or great feast. It opened with the great Advent responsory, one of the jewels of liturgical art, with its sense of awe-struck expectation—'I beheld from afar, and saw the Glory of God and a cloud covering the whole earth.' It closed with the acclamation of the Eternal Godhead, 'one and very Trinity, one and supreme Deity, holy and perfect Unity,' revealed in time through the incarnation of the Son. Between these points, week by week, the story of the Christian revelation was unfolded, and the mind of the worshipper led by all the resources of poetry and symbol to explore its inexhaustible significance.

Retained in a simplified form by Anglicans and Lutherans, though stripped of much of the liturgic beauty which it had gathered during its long development, this sequence was entirely abolished by the Presbyterian Churches. We can easily understand some of the reasons for its repudiation, along with much else which seemed at that time to be bound up with a deadening formalism, and to threaten spontaneity and realism in the approach of the soul to God. None the less, the virtual abandonment of the 'liturgical year' has meant in the Churches which took this drastic course a serious spiritual impoverishment; for with it they cast away the rich gifts of history and poetry, with all that these had to contribute to corporate and expressive worship. So there are many reasons why the present revival of interest in liturgical forms—for example, in the Church of Scotland—should include some attempt at its restoration.

The first and outstanding reason is this. Christianity is fundamentally a historical, one might even say a dramatic, religion. To conceive of it either in terms of pure moralism, or in terms of pure interiority, is to misunderstand its genius from the start. It announces the love and grace and redeeming power of God given through and in a human life, and manifested by sensible signs. Therefore it consecrates history as a medium of the divine self-imparting: puts before us, not only a series of spiritual and ethical truths and demands, but a series of factual happenings, and gives to these factual happenings an inexhaustible significance.

> O marvellous interchange! The Creator of mankind, taking on him a living body, vouchsafed to be born of a Virgin:
>
> And begotten in no earthly manner, hath made us to be partakers of his Divinity.[1]

There, once for all, are the credentials of that historical element which the Church reduces or neglects at her peril; and which, in one way or another, she must weave into the fabric of her worship. For, the more deeply we meditate on the successive moments of the Christian story, the more profoundly we are penetrated by the eternal reality which they convey; and this in a manner which can be understood by the simplest, and yet which the greatest saint can never exhaust. Therefore, it is a part of the Church's task to bring again and again to the minds of her children these subjects of meditation: sometimes in their homely and intimate aspect, sometimes in their transcendental significance.

> While all things were in quiet silence, and night was in the midst of her swift course:
>
> Thine almighty Word leaped down from heaven out of thy royal throne, alleluia![2]

Now the device of the Christian Year, following each moment of the Christian revelation from its promise at Advent to its fulfilment at Pentecost, is a sovereign method by means of which the Church can apply history to the purposes of devotion; emphasizing turn by turn the beauty, the cost, the undying power of redemption, and building up round these varied disclosures of God's love for man and self-giving to man her acts of adoration, penitence, thanksgiving, and joy. It is strange, then, that a method of worship which keeps so close to the gospel, which stresses the objective character of God's revelation in Christ, and is indeed entirely concerned with our Lord's life and death, should ever have fallen into disrepute. Here, surely, we

[1] Antiphon: Octave of Christmas Day.

[2] Antiphon of the Benedictus in Christmastide.

have evangelical worship in its purest form; and there should have been little difficulty in discarding such late-mediæval accretions as blurred its noble outlines, and restoring the liturgical cycle to something approaching its original austere simplicity. And moreover, if—as Bérulle has said—Christ is Himself the major sacrament, then His life in its total movement and in each of its great 'states' of helpless childhood, dedicated manhood, devoted service, sacrificial love, and liberated power, must be the great theme of a specifically Christian worship; and each of these will have its own peculiar sacramental value. It will give us God in a specific way, and will be a means of grace to the Church and each member of the Church; since in each we contemplate from a particular angle the Word made flesh. Therefore an important part of the Church's life of worship, says the Russian theologian Boulgakoff, consists in 'making these sacred memories live again, so that we again witness and take part in them.'

Moreover, this deliberate linking up of religious feeling and historic fact, so plainly appropriate to an incarnational faith, puts the weight of worship where it should be put—in the humble and joyous contemplation of the divine perfection, not the anxious contemplation of our own sin; and by means of a cycle which touches every aspect of our life, and evokes a wide range of emotional response, defeats monotony, that arch-enemy of institutional religion. There is a sense in which the fervent liturgic Christian does really live again through the drama of redemption; experiences year by year, and with no sense of unreality, the awed expectation of Advent; enters ever more fully into the mystery of the Crib, the purifying discipline of the forty days in the Wilderness, the tension and heart-breaking majesty of Holy Week, the triumph of Easter. It is surely right that the Church should help him to do this; by means of her liturgic life maintaining the essential contact between theology and devotion, sounding the heights and deeps of Christian thought and feeling, and sweeping all her members with her into the great life-giving stream of her traditional prayer.

Round this liturgic year, of which some elements seem almost as old as Christianity itself, all the poetry of devotion has gathered, and made it the supreme art-work of the Church's soul. No one who has heard, or even read, the Reproaches of Good Friday, the Exultet of Easter Eve, or the Easter vigil service of the Orthodox rite, can fail to catch here the very accent of the Church's adoration; or miss the deep realism with which she enters into the experiences of her Lord. And apart from these great instances, the beautiful device of antiphons and responsaries—almost invariably built up from Biblical material—which gave variety and special colour to the daily offices, might give new interest and beauty to our Sunday worship. The painfully this-world and self-interested character of many of the attempts to improve the quality of that worship suggest that here contemporary Christianity has something to learn; and that a bringing back into our services of some of the liturgic treasures which the past has bequeathed to us, might at least be a step towards the realization of nobler and more disinterested ideals. The aim of all worship is, as towards God, the praise of His glory; as towards man, an increase of that faith and love, that awe-struck delight, which is the raw material of adoration. How better can we hope to nourish this, than by the constant remembrance of those Mysteries in and through which the Divine Charity was manifested in the temporal world?

Faith, Rational and Religious.

By the Reverend T. Wigley, M.A., London.

We are witnessing to-day a flight not only from faith, but from reason in all departments of our life. The question is rarely asked whether there is any connexion between these two attitudes of mind, or what are the reasons for the failure of their appeal. We are, I think, being brought face to face with the problem which Maurice stressed in a letter to Hort with regard to the eighteenth-century substitution of Nature or at best a Demiurgus for God. If, as Maurice contended, the idea of revelation in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was the announcement of certain decrees, imperative laws enacted by God, and in the nineteenth century it was a belief in the creative energy of man, the twentieth century has to face the necessity of reconciling these ideas, 'each of which by itself tends to atheism and superstition.' Religion can no more be established on the foundations of present-day irrationality than it could be on the foundation of Mansel's complete scepticism, and those who in our own day pride themselves on disparaging reason in the name of an other-worldly theology should take warning from the fact that the naturalism of Herbert Spencer followed the transcendentalism of Mansel.

The voice of warning sounds from a more distant time than the nineteenth century. In that ancient writing called the Clementine 'Recognitions,' which belongs to the age of the Apostolic Fathers, Peter is made to say, 'It is not safe to commit these things to bare Faith without Reason, since truth cannot be without reason. He who has received truths fortified by reason can never lose them; whereas he who receives them without proofs, by simple assent, can neither keep them safely, nor be sure that they are true. The more anxious any man is in demanding a reason, the more secure will he be in keeping his Faith.' In our own scientific age, though the adjective describes the attitude of mind only of the minority upon whom the future depends, it is becoming increasingly clear that faith is the condition of attaining knowledge, and that knowledge thus attained so far from superseding faith enriches and confirms it. The evil effects of regarding faith as a goal-post rather than a sign-post are to be seen on all hands. Faith has come to be associated with the static rather than the dynamic, with the *status quo ante* rather than the inspiration to progress. Consolidation has its rightful place in the warfare of the spirit as well as of the body, but it becomes a menace when it puts an end to further advance against the enemies of ignorance, apathy, and evil. Assurance of truth can never be gained except by the whole man in action expressing himself along the parallel lines of intellect, feeling, and will. We become expert only in and through experiment. Our urgent need to-day is therefore not only an experiential religion, which may be only the empty echo of others' words, but a religion experimental, which has a zest for discovery and a joy in the new. The faithful experimenter does not, however, try it on in every direction. While not bound by the past, he is wisely guided by it; he learns from past mistakes, and avoids even the sacred cul-de-sac in which so many have made their permanent abode. Thus truth grows based on knowledge and experience, and it should be noted that emotional satisfaction alone gives us no warrant for the assertion that any belief we care to hold is true. When we undertake to think the thoughts of God, we are setting our minds to a task which will demand something more than clear-cut definitions; it will involve the correspondence between idea and fact, and a readiness to abandon old hypotheses, when these no longer show themselves fruitful either in covering the facts already known or in stimulating to further discovery.

Even in connexion with the question of God's existence, the truth of the late Professor Gwatkin's dictum, 'There are many proofs of God's existence, but no demonstrations,' is not yet widely appreciated. Hence we cannot too often repeat the obvious fact that final postulates of thought are incapable of demonstration; ultimate principles from which proof proceeds cannot themselves be proved. Hypotheses, or if it is preferred, 'acts of faith,' are true in so far as they render arrangement of phenomena possible. In such acts there is no leaping out of the sphere of fact into a transcendent and wholly other beyond; rather by means of them we reach our data. Here the man of science and the man of religion are at one, if each of them has realized the implication of his thinking and doing, for though the fundamental human activities, the intellectual, the æsthetic, the moral, and the religious, are *sui generis* each with its fundamental value, they are all part of that greatest of all wholes called Truth. It is not without significance that Dr. J. H. Woodger, the well-known biologist, should confess, 'The exercise of the intellectual activity in the pursuit of science rests upon beliefs for which no reason can be given—belief in our intuitions of an external world, of other selves, and of the validity of inductive inference, as well as on the intuitive belief in truth and moral values.' He then goes on to illustrate by pointing out that the man of science who falsifies his results is not breaking a logical law but an ethical one. Our seemingly separate and various activities are entwined in a curious way, for both the intellectual and the æsthetic activities are at one in their search for order, simplicity, and economy of expression, and to-day we are not surprised when the mathematician speaks of the 'almost divine beauty' of certain equations. If this oneness of man's activities had been recognized in the nineteenth century, we should have been saved from the disastrous idea that the conflict between religion and science was inevitable. The evil effects of this grotesque assumption still poison people's minds, and cause most of our difficulties when we seek to lead men along the way of understanding. I am not here concerned with the conflicts between particular scientific theories and particular theological doctrines, but rather with the need for that harmonization which may legitimately be called rational and religious, whose chief enemy is a one-sided particularism.

We have seen, then, that the man of science has faith in the power of thought to solve the problem on which he is engaged; he believes in the value of the hypothesis which he is seeking to verify. He also trusts what he cannot demonstrate, namely, that Nature will exhibit in the future the uniformity which she has shown in the past. When such is apparently not the case, he invariably looks for the disturbing factor, which when discovered may open the door of a new world, as has recently happened in atomic physics. In these days, however, in which the ordinary man is in danger of becoming mathematically intoxicated, Professor H. Levy exercises a steadying influence. He says: 'That to deal with the set of experimental results as a set of numbers, dissociated not merely from the details of the experiment to which they refer, but from the whole matrix of scientific knowledge into which it must fit, is to commit a fallacious isolation.' Disembodied numbers work as much havoc with many people's mental machinery as theological ideas isolated from life. The truly religious man trusts his reason as expressing the essential oneness of his complex nature, and when in faith he makes assumptions which the process of verification shows to be inconsistent with the facts, he proves his rationality by discarding his assumptions, since he recognizes the rightfulness of the claim that his faith shall not lead to a world-view which is contradictory. No hypothesis in science or in theology is so sacrosanct that we should be afraid to bring it to the touchstone of the fact, and in spite of the tendencies so painfully prevalent to-day to exalt irrationality in literature and in psychology as well as in religion, there can, I think, be no doubt at all that in the long run such irrationality is doomed to failure. Both Bethune-Baker and C. C. J. Webb draw attention to the not always understood or discriminating welcome given in some English theological circles to the philosophy of religion set forth in Otto's remarkable book, *The Holy*. The same lack of discrimination is to be noted in the more recent and even more unthinking rush for safety within the Barthian boundaries. A faith which is not rational is not religious; a faith which is not religious is not rational.

Some may call this 'mere intellectualism,' which tries somehow to find a place for God in its picture of the world, but the charge has as little truth in it as the equally common dismissal of a revival of religion as 'mere emotionalism.' The word 'mere' is a veritable asylum for those who will not think, and it would be well if it were generally agreed to give it a long, long rest. The truth is that there is no such thing as a 'mere' anything, and we do not need to be familiar with the thought of A. N. Whitehead to realize that fact. The isolate exists only for our convenience and in our imagination. That alone is reasonable which satisfies us as thinking, feeling, and willing beings. In the words of the late Sir Henry Jones: 'No age of the world was ever strong except where faith and reason went hand in hand, and where man's practical ideals were also his surest truths.' Faith which is rational and religious does not attempt the absurd task of fitting God into the picture, since He Himself is the picture, or, as Inge prefers, He is the canvas on which the picture is painted, the frame within which it is set. Atheism is to be rejected therefore not so much because it is unthinkable as because it is absurd, and in spite of Heisenberg mankind has no love of chaos. We find neither comfort nor sense in indeterminate caperings either in the human or the atomic world. We may spend a diverting evening in wondering what is going to happen next at a show, but to spend a lifetime in such a diversion would be more than humankind could bear; in the best shows the acts are according to programme, and even a comedian's best impromptus are prepared.

We are now, I hope, in a position to appreciate the point of view of those who continually urge that the appeal of religious truth is not to the head but to the heart, not to reason but to faith; for them reason is the equivalent of intellect, and faith has nothing to do with it. Religion, they say, is the immediate communion of the soul with God, and the Spirit of God is its own witness to the devout and believing heart. In other words, it doesn't matter under what flag you march, nor in what direction, provided you believe in it. The world is full of flag-wavers and flag-followers, the trumpets blare with no uncertain note, but who will say that the processions are getting anywhere, or that even the leaders know where they are going? There is much feeling, but little reason, which is natural since the whole contention is that religion belongs to a sphere beyond reason. The only reply of this school of feeling to reason's demand for systematic though unfettered statement is the simple, dogmatic assertion, 'I see it, I feel it to be true.' On this point the dancing Dervish is in agreement with the holy roller. But just as the attainment of scientific truth is morally conditioned, so the attainment of religious truth is intellectually conditioned. Feeling never exists *in vacuo*, it is always feeling about something. Even the ignorant saint, of whom we are so often reminded, would be at least a more-effective-for-something saint, if he added knowledge to his love. Frankly, I am beginning to doubt whether he exists at all. In rational religious faith, then, feeling has its true place only in relationship, and Goethe's words, 'Feeling is everything; words are sound and smoke,' are simple nonsense. This nonsense has led all too many to give practical effect to the philosophy which says, 'Do whatever your heart, your instincts, your emotions prompt you to do, beware of thinking too much, reflection retards progress.' So frequently has this been proclaimed by dramatists, novelists, and others that it is being widely assumed that emotions are desirable ends in themselves without rational or religious significance; we are in danger of losing ourselves in a psycho-pathological wilderness. Not in this way shall we express our love of God in the understanding of our minds, the consecration of our lives, and the devotion of our wills to His ends.

If there is no place for ignorance, however pridefully pronounced, neither is there any place for the dogmatic assertion that the test of a man's religion shall be his acceptance or rejection of a particular theological theory. We must repudiate the notion that the state of a man's soul before God can be determined by his idea of atonement or the Person of Jesus. Creeds and confessions have their use as helps along the way, but to suggest that we are dependent upon them for spiritual sustenance in this world, and possibly in the next, is to deny to the Spirit of God that freedom of creation which we claim for ourselves and see incarnate in every light-bearing soul. To deny that man shall be permitted rationally to investigate religious assertions and claims is to condemn the modern mind to religious decay; this would be a situation as tragic for the modern world as for religion, and it is one the possibility of which we dare not overlook. Admittedly the child acts before he reflects, so science also had its birth, but neither the child nor science would make any progress, if it did not by reflection seek to discover meaning in its experiences. I would go so far as to suggest that it is only in such turning back to discover that religion emerges. We therefore do men an ill service when we attempt to stifle rational systematic thought, especially when this is done in the name of faith. If our faith does not compel us to clarify our ideas, to see on what grounds they rest, to what they point and their relationships, we shall end by finding ourselves either faithless to the needs of our time or sinking into the bog of superstition without a bubble to show our passing. The tragedy of reason and religion committing suicide in each other's arms is one which we should find difficult to contemplate with equanimity.

Truth is its own witness, but not all that seems to be true is true. Our dearest personal convictions may be mistaken, and the history of science as well as of religion is littered not only with dead and dying hypotheses, but with examples of statements and systems receiving a devotion and an obedience due only to truth itself. The letter kills, the Spirit is life-giving. There is only one way in which we can learn to distinguish between the accidental husk of form and the essential kernel of truth, and that is the way of reflective thought. We rejoice that along this way our idea of God and duty changes; such a story of developing change can be read in our Bible literature interpreted in the light of modern study. It would be an incalculable gain to truth in religion if it were clearly understood in the churches that the Hebrews themselves left behind as inadequate the primitive ideas of God held by their forefathers. What has been called the Sultanic idea of God, enthroned in some seat of power above the sky, who repents and is appeased by gifts and sacrifices, continues to dominate much of present-day theology, and when we are told that such expressions are symbolical and not to be taken literally we must urge that out of adequate and inadequate symbols it is our duty to choose the former; only the fittest symbols should survive in modern theology. If this elementary duty had been kept in mind, Church history would have been saved from many pitiful controversies and the world from our absurd divisions. It is not man's business to create truth, but to discover and to set it forth; 'the unseen is the realm of faith, not the unreasonable.' Faith is a manifold attitude, and so is reason. Can it be that in essence and rightly understood the two are one? 'If salvation could be discovered without great toil, how could it be neglected by nearly all men?' asked Spinoza, and he added, 'but all things excellent are as difficult as they are rare.' And T. H. Huxley said: 'Sit down before fact as a little child, be prepared to give up every preconceived notion, to follow humbly wherever and to whatever abysses Nature leads you, or you shall learn nothing.' He adds this confession: 'I have only begun to learn content and peace of mind since I have resolved at all risks to do this.' We are brought at last to that gate which opens only at the approach of the childlike mind, eager and venturing, which puts all things to the test in faith, rational and religious.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Wonderful Transformation.

By the Reverend J. T. Taylor, Helmsley, York.

'As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.'—1 Co 15[49].

First of all I have to tell the story of the caterpillar, any ordinary creeping caterpillar.

(Let me, however, ask you not to say some of the things about caterpillars that people are only too ready to say about them. Don't say, 'Oh, we know quite well what happens to caterpillars. Some are crushed by the feet of those who pass by, others are eaten by birds, while worse things still happen to some of them.' It is all quite true, but I am going to talk about the caterpillars to which none of these things happen. And please do not say, 'Caterpillars are such horrid things.' They are not really horrid things, but even if they are that would not be a reason for failing to study them. Besides, they probably look on *us* as being extremely horrid things. Especially do not say that you know all there is to know about caterpillars. If you did you would know more about them than most learned men who have studied them for years and years. *Now we can get on!*)

Let me say that some caterpillars are creatures of the most amazing beauty. The 'Woolly Bear' scurries across the roadway in the autumn-time. It is no wonder that he scurries. You would if you had as many enemies as he has. If you can delay him for a moment you will see that under his fur he is a living jewel. Some of his friends can boast golden stripes, and others glowing crimson spots. Hardly one of them is without a decoration of some sort. One wonders sometimes what it is all for.

For us the striking thing is that caterpillars have three lives. They have *a life that now is*, and two others which *are yet to come.* Or, possibly, the better way to put it would be, that they have two lives, one of which they are now living, and one that is as yet magically in the future, and a long, long sleep that lies between.

The first is a very lowly life. It is a very busy, crawling life. And they should be well able to crawl! They have six true legs, and I forget how many besides. They have at least six times as many as we have, and they travel six times as fast—that is, of course, in proportion to their size. It is an eating life too. And how they do eat! Cabbage, lettuce, leaves, nettles, plants, nothing comes amiss to them. Talk about a meal that lasts all day. It is the only meal that is of any use to the caterpillar. Why, a caterpillar eats its own weight of food in one day, and no boy that I have ever heard of can do that!

By and by, however, caterpillars grow tired of it all, tired of crawling, tired of eating, tired of everything. I imagine them saying, 'We cannot tell what is the matter with us, we feel so tired, so sleepy.' They then seek out a spot to rest in. Some hide in the ground, others make a cradle of silk for themselves. One and all go off to sleep. And strange things happen in that sleep. You might at first be very troubled at what happens, but in the end you would marvel. This is the caterpillars' 'sleep-life,' and if they could explain they might say, 'This is our way to a larger life.'

Before long there comes the wonder-life. One glorious spring morning I was making my way through the meadows. A warm wind caressed the flowers, and shook out the green silken raiment of the trees. In front of me the wind was rolling what looked like a date stone. But date stones do not roll before the wind as that object did. So I stooped to examine it. It was an empty chrysalis case, the vacant home of one of the lovely creatures with jewelled wings that were fluttering about in the sunshine. The butterflies could not possibly have any knowledge of the miracle that had happened to them. Had they been aware of it they might possibly have told me, 'We reached the morning through the night, the day through the deep darkness, and life through death'!

It is surely not too much to hope that for us a 'wonder-life' may follow the busy, lowly life which we live here and the 'sleep-life' that follows it. We shall then be able to say triumphantly with the Apostle Paul, 'Death' (our name for the sleep-life) 'is swallowed up in victory.'

What Footprints do you Leave?

By the Reverend P. N. Bushill, B.A., Orpington.

'They mark my steps.'—Ps 56^6.

In *The Times* newspaper of 10th February the story was told of a young Austrian who crossed the border into Czechoslovakia and was arrested. And do you know why he was arrested? Because wherever he walked he left the sign of the 'swastika' on the ground! He had had his boot soles studded with nails in the shape of a swastika—the Greek cross, with each arm bent at right angles—the present-day symbol of the Nazis. Previously various cunning attempts had been made, such as the burning of the swastika in fields of corn, or even clipping it into the coats of dogs, but this was certainly a novel and unique method, to imprint it with one's footprints into the soil of the country. He left his footprints, which showed his political faith, wherever he went.

We all leave our footprints. One of the most exciting parts of that exciting boys' story *Robinson Crusoe* is where the hero of the story, after some time on what he thought was an uninhabited island, one day discovered a footprint in the sand. 'It happened one day about noon,' he says, 'going towards my boat, I was exceedingly surprised with the print of a man's naked foot on the shore, which was very plain to be seen in the sand. I stood like one thunderstruck, or as if I had seen an apparition; I listened, I looked round me, but I could hear nothing, nor see anything.' The footprint told the story that there was another man on the island, whom Crusoe later discovered, and whom he named 'Friday.'

We all leave our footprints, and the footprints tell a great deal.

What footprints do you leave? What do your footprints tell? Footprints on the sands of Time

1. *They reveal your Course.*—You leave footprints behind you, and people can trace your steps and follow you. They can tell the way you are going. I expect some of you play 'tracking,' following the marks of some animal, or motor, or person. Great fun! Well, others are watching you. The text says, 'They mark my steps,' and often they follow where you lead. How important it is that you should tread the right path. It is difficult sometimes to know the right path to take, but the Lord Jesus has helped us. He has left us an example that we should follow in His steps (1 P 2^2). Remember the prayer that we sometimes sing:

O let me see Thy footmarks
And in them plant mine own.

2. *They reveal your Custom.*—Your footprints gradually make a path, if you go the same way continually. Do you sometimes see a dog's run across the garden, and through the fence? Once going over that way would hardly leave any trace, but because that dog makes it a regular habit you can quite clearly see his run. A missionary from the Congo says that the men and women there, when they become Christians, are encouraged to build a separate little prayer-room behind their houses, because there is no privacy in a Congo hut; and it can easily be seen whether that prayer-room is used, for if it is not used weeds quickly grow in between. Footmarks reveal custom.

3. *They reveal your Character.*—Every one knew when they saw the footprints of that young Austrian that he was a Nazi; it revealed what his beliefs were. 'They mark your steps,' and your steps, your tracks, reveal your character. Let them be footprints on errands of kindness, ready, alert footprints to help others in difficulty; regular, steady footprints to church and Sunday school—these are some of the symbols of the character of a Christian.

We want to be as keen on the signs of our Christian faith as that young Austrian was on the swastika, the sign of his political faith: we want our footprints to show our love and loyalty to Jesus. As day by day we seek to follow 'in His steps,' then indeed will those who 'mark our steps' recognize our faith and love, and will be reminded of Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour.

The Christian Year.

EASTER DAY.

Christ the First-fruits.

'But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept.'—1 Co 15[20].

In his charming book of eastern travel, A. W. Kinglake describes a weary week's march across the Desert. They had to push on under a flaming sky, in which the fierce sun 'brandished his fiery sceptre as if he had usurped dominion over both heaven and earth.' The eighth night came on them still within the confines of the Desert, but one of the Arabs, without a word, stalked off towards the west, and returned some hours later 'with an ear of rice, full and fresh and green.' From that region of death he had travelled to the borders of the living world, and had brought back this sure token that life itself was near and pleasant. It was the first-fruits of life, and it is the same message that Paul brings to the disheartened race of men.

Sometimes in a train one becomes so engrossed in book or game that one has no thought for the country which is racing past the windows, but at some pause he lifts his eyes and greets the spectacle with an exclamation of delight. It is not the will of God that men should be saved by argument, and yet it has its necessary uses and its fascination; but frequently Paul breaks away from it, and, catching sight of the inimitable sure things which are above debate, he hails them like a child with cries of delight.

In this passage, in answer to those who denied the resurrection of Jesus, he had been detailing all that would follow if they were right. For one thing, the witness of the Apostles would be proved false, and (what is of wider interest), all those who had trusted in this Living Saviour to redeem them from evil ways would have been deluded, and would still be in their sins; and, finally, those who had died in the faith that a Friend was waiting in the shadow to receive them must have perished. But at this point he lifts his eyes and sees the facts as they are: 'Christ *has* risen,' he declares.

1. What thus made him glad was the sense he had of a breach in the tyranny of death. This fair world in all its parts had seemed to be under sentence, for all things die—flowers and beasts, men and their institutions, even worlds also are subject to this rule. Life may vary vastly in its length: an insect dances in the sun for a few hours, a nation may fill the pages of history for half a millennium, a world endures for millions of years, yet for each the end is fixed.

This universal rule of death is not a cause for outcry or protest, since it is God's instrument for making room for new life. Fresh gifts are always on their way, and a place must be found for these, and new men must be free to play their part unhampered by the great ones of a former time. Even our Lord Jesus said of His own departing, 'It is expedient for you that I go away.' Death is not mere loss, and yet as we watch persons and things about us growing old and disappearing it is hard to avoid the sense of dismay, for death reigns.

Moralists of Paul's time spoke of another victory of death which seemed the most lamentable of all, for they pointed back to a Golden Age, when men were innocent and gentle and upright; but this also had yielded to the insatiable devourer of men. The world itself, as they felt, was growing old, and, however men might long for it, they could not recapture that lost spring-time. Even wisdom seemed to decay, for the most original thinkers and the greatest poets and artists were gone, and in that sumptuous imperial age men were content to copy and combine. Each act in turn reached its height and then began to fail.

This sobering impression is renewed in every generation for each new year brings its own chronicle of loss. Things grow old with so confounding a rapidity, and nothing can turn them young again. Benjamin Jowett sombrely says of this temper that 'we begin to understand that things never did really matter so much as we suppose'; and accordingly, many people, as years increase, lay hold of plans and opportunities and hopes and loves more limply, as not of any lasting account, for they feel that Death reigns.

It is with triumph in his tone that Paul proclaims one glorious breach of this sad law. Christ has risen from the dead. It may be a solitary exception, but, like Kinglake's green ear of rice after the Desert march, it gives assurance of life as near. 'Christ has risen from the dead, the *first-fruits* of those who sleep,' for to His friends His Resurrection has always appeared as the promise and the actual beginning of a second spring.

2. This confidence of theirs is based not on the bare fact that some one has risen, that the universal law has been broken, but on the fact that it is Christ who rose. 'One swallow does not make a summer,' as we say, and one single exception could scarcely create a new situation; it might stir interest and some flickerings of hope, it would not beget a victorious confidence. For this we need to look at the character and the purpose of Him who made the exception. Now when we survey the story of the life of Jesus, one characteristic cannot fail to strike us, for nothing that this Man did or planned was for Himself alone.

When Paul exhorts his friends in Philippi to 'look not on their own concerns but also on what concerns others,' he adds at once, 'let this mind be in you which was in Christ Jesus,' for this self-forgetting temper was His distinguishing characteristic. It would be easy to exhibit this right through His career. Even of His first appearance on earth the Nicene Creed declares that it was 'for us men and for our salvation that He became man'; at the Baptism He might reasonably have stood aloof, since He had no faults to abandon and no nearer fellowship with God to attain. When Matthew describes the healing ministry he borrows the words from Isaiah, 'He bore our infirmities and shouldered our sicknesses,' for to a loving onlooker it seemed that the load which He lifted from other backs was almost visibly laid upon His. Even men's healing was at His cost, who would not alone be brought to glory. As the end approaches this principle becomes emphatic more and more, and on the night on which He was betrayed He said at the Supper, 'This is My body, and it is for you: this is My blood—Covenant blood,' by which for them a wholly new relation of confidence towards God was made possible. Thus at every stage the same note recurs—for others, with others; and the Resurrection comes under no different rule.

The life we have is so imperfect and so precarious that we are often tempted to accept the teaching of ordinary experience, and admit that strength is bound to fail and life to run out in the dark. Even before Christ a braver hope than this was appearing: 'Thou wilt show me the path which leads to life,' says one, and another asserts that 'the path of the just is as the shining light, which shineth more and more unto the perfect day.' The hope of life was even then not entirely lacking, though it was difficult and rare. 'But now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first-fruits of them that sleep'; since that is true, we are not in the winter of our discontentment, not even, as in Scotland, in a reluctant and hesitating spring. In those who know the Risen One life should discover all its powers, so that, whatever they may have to distress them, they may face it gallantly; for, as Peter says, 'God raised him from the dead and gave him glory, that our faith might also be a hope in God.'[1]

First Sunday after Easter.

More than Conquerors.

By the Reverend T. A. Bampton, Frome.

'In all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us.'—Ro 8^{37}.

What can be better than the best? To have achieved is surely sufficient for any man. To vanquish the foe, to see him flying across the plain, or lying dead on the field of battle, this surely is the pinnacle of victory.

The moment of danger in our lives comes when we say, 'The best is good enough for me.' The heresy of the ages lies in a naïve belief in the best. The best thought of our age has often succeeded in producing a second best religion. Paul was a firm believer in the mediocrity of the best. Mr. Aldous Huxley is satisfied if mankind does reasonably well. In *Beyond the Mexique Bay*, he writes: 'Man's biological success was due to the fact that he never specialized. Unfitted by his physique to do any one thing to perfection, he was forced to develop the means for doing everything reasonably well.'

The question is not where shall we be when we have arrived, but to where shall we proceed from that point of vantage? When the social system is perfected, when men and women with whom the social system deals are perfect, when the conditions of living on this planet have reached the point beyond which they cannot be improved, when war ceases, disease is conquered, everybody happy and nobody poor, what then? When humanity arrives, where will it be, and what will it do when it gets there? Einstein tells us that the diameter of the universe is 216 million light-years. The lay mind promptly inquires 'But what is beyond that?' The measuring of the universe leaves us much in the same frame of mind as the thought of perfection. We feel the narrowness of such a conception. Man's characteristic claustrophobia is his smug satisfaction with circumferences and delimitations.

All systems of thought, political speculations and social ideals that leave out Christ, by that same token affirm their contentment with the best as a defined limit. Their weakness lies in their inability to point out to man the way whereby 'above himself he can erect himself.'

---

[1] W. M. Macgregor, *Christ and the Church*, 157.

1. It is the unique distinction of the Christian faith that it removes the barrier of the best. Those who commit themselves to Christ not only arrive, but travel beyond. They are not only conquerors, but more than conquerors. Inexhaustibility is the characteristic of the God to whom the Christian is linked up in Christ. Does any cult of philosophy offer you conquest, so that you may spend the rest of your life as a crowned victor among your fellows? Christianity goes beyond that.

'Success is man's god,' says Æschylus. 'More than conquerors,' says Paul.

2. The catalogue of those things in which Paul was more than conqueror is representative of all the possible contingencies of our earthly life. It is compiled from the vivid experiences of his own career as a Christian missionary. They are the trials he himself had undergone in the adventurous and dangerous life he had lived. He knew, only too well, the anguish of bodily pain, the calamities of the Christ-filled life in the Roman Empire, the persecutions and pursuits of his zealous and fanatical compatriots, the hunger of the body from which he fed his soul, the naked defencelessness of himself and his companions in Asia Minor and Eastern Europe, the hazards of the great venture in the name of Christ. Through Christ he had not only won through, but had won through so triumphantly as to enter upon the timeless and limitless glory of the life with no horizons.

3. There is a quality in the overplus which is not to be found within the margins of mere attainment. The actions of a man receive their meaning not as they are his own actions, but as they are prompted and initiated by God. What is only a victory in man becomes more than a victory when a man is on the side of God. It is victory surcharged with all the potentialities of the Spirit of God. In Paul, personal achievement became significant and historical fact. His victories were also victories for Christ and the Cross. So in the lesser lives of humble followers of Christ to-day, the small personal gains of daily life become filled with the eternal energy of God.

And every virtue we possess,
And every victory won,
And every thought of holiness,
Are His alone.

When our lives are linked with Christ, the best we know and do becomes better, the victory is transformed into an endless influence. Our superlatives are the starting-point of life in Christ. The best that man knows is the working material of God in the world. 'Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.'

What victory that ever won a Roman triumph or brought the world to the feet of any man can be compared with the eternal victory won by Christ on the Cross? What achievement of worldly success won in the struggle for existence, the fight for fame, indulged in by the forces in man's heart, can compare with the smallest victory over self and sin achieved by the humblest believer?

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

The Favour of Suffering.

'For unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake.'—Ph 1^{29}.

When Christianity first broke upon the world there were some people who, with very great shrewdness, said about it that it was something which, if it had its way, would turn the world upside down. Now, that is a criticism or observation which it will always be well for us to cherish. It tells us what our religion was like before the world had had time to tamper with it. For Christianity, though its spirit is supernatural, has nevertheless to find its task here in this present world. And so it happens that in course of time even a pure essence like the Christian spirit is apt to be compromised by the ceaseless pressure of the world. On some matters which were not of its very essence it will come to terms with human traditions and weaknesses; and the world, which also is a living thing, takes advantage of such concessions at the circumference, to make its own lower overtures to its essential spirit. Thus there have been times in history when Christianity as an institution has become too like the world, when it has seemed as though she had lost her vigour and her unworldliness and was content to settle down, pleased with the prestige and social respect with which the world was quite ready to treat her so long as she would be untroublesome and quiet. But let us be fair. Such periods of slackness and tameness and apparent assent to the world have endured only for a time. There is not surer proof of the reality of the living Christ than just this. Suddenly the sense of her supernatural calling has descended upon her, and she has found, with great gratitude to God, that in her soul she is not yet dead, that she is still able for Christ's sake to crucify the world and to have the world crucified within herself.

As Paulsen said: 'Christianity now and then becomes conscious of its original negative relation to the world and to the kingdom of this world, and so regains some of its pristine essence and strength. Christianity reconciled and at peace with the world is a weak and powerless affair, surely not the real and original Christianity. True Christianity may always be recognized by the fact that it seems strange and dangerous to the world.'

Carlyle has a grim parable of an orator at a street corner, crying out to the passers-by that everything was upside down, men, trees, houses, everything. Whereupon one of his hearers went forward and turned *him*, the speaker, upside down, that is to say, planted him on his feet! For it was he who had been standing on his head!

But one can imagine a parable infinitely more powerful of a man standing at a street corner assuring everybody who passed by that everything as it is to-day is just about all right. And one can imagine Christ coming by, whereupon, as they look at each other, Christ and that tame approver of this present world, the terrible idea dawns upon him that if Christ standing there is right, most things are wrong.

A Russian publicist in the days before the Revolution, and while the Russians were our allies in the field and were piling up that holocaust of six million casualties which, let us not forget it, was their contribution towards our victory, said: 'You send us a telegram when we have gained a victory, assuring us of your love. But we do not need a telegram assuring us of your love when we have gained a victory; we are very happy. Why do you not send us a telegram assuring us of your love on the morning after some great defeat? Then we would love it, for then we need it.'

We have the same feeling of paradox, of the contradiction to what seems natural, in these words of St. Paul to the Philippians, words in which he tells them that to them it had been granted, as having something of the nature of a favour, on the behalf of Christ, not only to believe in Him—a matter which a great many people with various depths of meaning may be capable of—but also to suffer for His sake. They are, so to speak, he tells them, Christians of the second degree.

It is the very basis of our hope for the world that there will always be an elect and saving community scattered over the earth who are willing to endure, and to endure for the sake of something or some one invisible.

No man can be a Christian who is not now, at this very moment, suffering something for Christ's sake. It may be some young man who is day by day fighting like a man against some low business of his own soul or flesh. It may be some man later on, refusing some success or advantage for the sake of a scruple of integrity. Or it may be one, at any time in life, called upon to endure some loss in the region of human love, or some lesser loss in the region of fortune or of friends, who nevertheless will not allow his soul to become bitter within him.

It is the nature of every belief that it costs one something. A person who has social ambitions—and that is the real translation of the New Testament 'worldliness'—will lie awake at night, planning how to promote his or her social prestige. And such persons will pay almost any price wherewith to purchase such a corruptible crown.

We can see, however, what St. Paul may have meant in drawing a distinction between classes even of Christian people, and in saying that there are Christians, so to speak, of the first degree and that there are Christians, so to speak, of the second degree. There are those who, it would appear, are elected to a certain additional strain upon their faith. This added strain may have come to them because of an extra sensitiveness which they have.

To such people, to all indeed who can honestly claim the words are fitting their case, St. Paul says here something which should have the effect at once of steadying their minds and bringing back dignity and self-respect. In any case, it is something very gracious. For there are times when one envies those who, to judge from appearances, do not allow their minds or their feelings to distress them. But in our better moments we do not envy them. We agree, as our Lord was sure we should, that it is much better to be a man than to be a sheep. St. Paul says all that here, and he says something besides, something slightly different. Speaking to people who for the sake of Christ were really enduring some hard and adverse thing—enduring not merely some rare and mysterious trouble of the mind, but enduring some concrete suffering at the hands of the world, suffering which, we may suppose, they could have escaped if they had only lowered the flag of their soul—St. Paul bids them consider whether God may not have called upon them in particular to endure this added rigour, and that it was, strictly speaking, a proof that in God's view they were able to endure more than ordinary people could endure.

Our mind naturally turns to-day to that outstanding example of the man who has not lowered the flag of his soul—Dr. Martin Niemöller. He was rearrested immediately after his discharge and sent to the dread concentration camp at Sachsenhausen. Writing to his wife from prison, he said, 'You may tell the whole committee and any others of the congregation who come to see you that, although I am quite uncertain as to what may be coming, I am at peace; and that I hope to be ready if I am led by paths which I have not sought.'

In a later letter (January 1938) we find him saying: 'Somehow in these last six months the ship of the Church has got afloat again. The colour is dimmed, the masts are broken, the whole appearance is not handsome; but the Lord Christ still sits at the helm, and the ship moves forward! . . .

'And I think my imprisonment also belongs to the holy humour of God. First the mocking laughter: "Now we've got that fellow!" and then the imprisonment; and what are the consequences? Full churches, a praying community.

Rage, world and spring;
I stand here and sing,
  My heart is at peace,
Since I live in God's care,
Earth and hell may beware,
  Their fierce threatenings cease.

'To get bitter about such things would be shameful ingratitude.'

The idea is that at every moment in human history, in order to keep this world from going to pieces, a certain amount of suffering, of endurance or substitutionary pain, must continually be in process of being borne; that in slack apostate times, when masses are living carelessly, life for that very reason becomes the more poignant, and almost oppressive, for those who will stand fast. Those who in such a time stand fast are Christ's Swiss Guard, so to speak, on whom He relies if all others should fall away. They are the friends such as at the wedding feast He found as He entered, sitting in a lowly place, to whom He said, 'Friends, come up higher, nearer to where I am sitting; for I perceive that ye are able to drink of the cup which I drank and to be baptized with the baptism wherewith I was baptized.'[1]

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

The Approach to Christ.

'For she said, If I may touch but his clothes, I shall be whole.'—Mk 5^{28}.

Let us try to get inside this woman's mind and find out what she was thinking, as she edged her way through the crowd to the Saviour's side.

We can take this much for certain, that her act was not the outcome of a sudden unpremeditated impulse, such as seizes excitable individuals when they find themselves in a crowd. She had evidently planned it all beforehand, and had thought out her little scheme. When we have a trying ordeal to face, something from which we naturally shrink, we keep our courage up to the pitch of action by going over the encouraging aspects of the case. It may cost us much to make the effort required, but we try to make light of it and tell ourselves that it will soon be over. That was what this timid creature did. She kept saying to herself, 'If I can just touch His clothes, I shall be cured. I am sure of it. I need not let Him know I am doing it, and nobody in the crowd will notice it.' It was the publicity of her venture that unnerved her, but she counted on getting the crowd to screen her efforts, and make an intentional contact appear casual.

Her stratagem revealed a confused idea of the Healer's power, as though it were some magnetic force that enveloped His person, and had magical efficacy. There was something very crude about her conception, something that needed correction and got it; but was there not something very sublime in its simplicity? She felt she did not require to invoke the fullness of the Godhead that dwelt in Him bodily. A mere touch of it would be sufficient for her purpose, and by the result she was justified.

We often ask for more assurance than we require that Jesus Christ is the power of God unto salvation. To have experience of His saving grace is a simpler matter than many imagine.

Men and women who are brought face to face with Christ stand back in the crowd around Him and take up a detached position, because they want to reason things out before taking the step to which their need is urging them. They want to be clear about Christ's person and His power to redeem their life from evil. And so they try to satisfy their inquiring spirits by elaborate arguments that land them in tremendous problems to which there is no finality.

We forget that one thing is needful, and that is not knowledge or understanding, but faith. It is a simple thing—a natural, instinctive thing, not a reasoned conviction of the mind, but a persuasion of the heart, not an argument but an act. It may be even a blundering act, but that will not prevent it getting what it wants. To faith Christ says, 'Be it unto thee as thou wilt.' It works. But there are many in the crowd around Christ who decline to stir a foot in His direction until they have satisfied themselves about His divinity. They want to form a reasoned conception of the mystery of the Incarnation, or work out a correct theory of the Atonement. They wait to be sure they have scientific authority for believing in miracles, before they commit themselves. And so they go on canvassing in their minds such ideas as are farthest from our common thought and everyday experience, and let Jesus of Nazareth pass because they have not yet been able to make up their minds about how to account for His influence and explain its working.

---

[1] J. A. Hutton, *The Victory over Victory*, 223.

What this simple-minded woman makes clear to us is that the approach to Christ is not to be made through science or theology. Our scientific knowledge may be rudimentary, our theological views may be as crude and confused as this woman's were, but that will never prevent our realizing the desire of our heart, if we are prepared to make a push for it. Jesus Christ may be beyond the compass of our thought, but He is always within reach of our faith. If we can't grasp Him in His fullness, we can at least touch Him at some point.

Let no one make the mistake of imagining that it is by hard thinking and subtle reasoning that he can find out God unto perfection, and Jesus Christ whom He has sent. We put God far from us by letting our minds dwell exclusively on His omnipotence and omnipresence, and such high themes. It takes us into a realm where we lose ourselves in the wilderness of His ways and lose Him too. He becomes a God who hides Himself and baffles our quest. We cannot worship omniscience or pray to omnipotence. We must find God's presence and power not merely in the universe, but within the limits of our own experience. We need a God on whom we can lean, one whom we can meet on the trodden path of life at any hour of the day, and tell Him our troubles. And we find Him in Jesus Christ. He has come within our reach—the Son of Man among men.

We credit His presence to the first century of the Christian era, and consign His influence to the past, as a memory embalmed in days that are no more. We are standing back and studying Him as an historical figure against the background of a holy land, or as an absentee Saviour enthroned on the far-off heights of glory. We think of Him as anywhere but in the midst of our crowded life, a living, active presence in the thronging interests of our common days. But Jesus Christ is one on whom we can lay our hand at any time, and receive the power He gives to become the sons of God.

It is not what we believe about Him, but to what extent we believe in Him, and how far we have gone to express it. Criticism may yet work changes in our creed. A newer theology may offer a fuller and truer explanation of Christ's person and work, but nothing can alter the fact that there is healing power in the hem of His garment.

Here we are forced back upon the fundamental inquiry that brings the whole matter to a point—a point of interrogation. If faith be the one condition of salvation—faith of some sort in the Son of God with power to renew our life—how is it to be acquired? Probe the workings of this poor sufferer's heart, and we find that it is begotten by a sense of need. What brought her to Christ was her need, and every one who is a seeker is near to being a finder.

There were many in that crowd treading in Jesus' tracks, but she dared to cross His path and put herself in His way. They were jostling Him, but the woman was the only one who made a definite approach to Him. They only wanted to see His power displayed in others. She wanted to feel it in her own person. While others were speculating on His claims, and indulging in academic discussions about His power, in which they had no personal interest, she was thinking furiously and acting with a life-and-death earnestness.

It is sometimes said that men and women to-day do not have the sense of sin they used to have. There are more people who are dissatisfied with themselves and the inner life they are living than care to confess it. They are conscious of their spiritual futility. Their feeble goodness and their lack of moral power cast a shadow on their brightest day.

It is to that widespread sense of shortcoming in our human nature that Jesus Christ makes His appeal. 'I am come that ye might have life, and know what life means in all its abounding fullness.' He has come to heal the hurt of His people, and He says to all of us, 'Wilt thou be made whole?'[1]

[1] J. Johnston, *The Discovery of God*, 70.

Interesting New Finds in Egypt.

By Alan Rowe, sometime Field Director, Egypt and Palestine Expeditions,
The Museum of the University of Pennsylvania, etc.

During the past few months or so, through the courtesy of the authorities concerned, I have had the honour of working upon the magnificent collection of scarabs and seals presented to The Egyptian Museum, Cairo, by the late King Fuâd. My researches, made with the idea of seeking further evidence on Ægypto-Canaanite associations, have enabled me to make some finds of much interest, two of which, namely, a 'letter' announcing the opening of a Canaanite well, and the discovery of the alphabetic system in scarab texts, will now be published in this article.

'Potiphera, Priest of On'

Before going on to discuss my own discoveries, however, I am taking the liberty of describing a most important stela or gravestone acquired some little time ago by the department of antiquities in Egypt; it is mentioned here by the kindness of the Museum officials. This stela is important because the inscription on it actually gives the Egyptian proper name Pedi-pa-Rê, which is none other than the long-sought-for original form of the Biblical 'Potiphera' and 'Potiphar,' the first being the name of the priest of On or Heliopolis, to the daughter of whom Joseph was married (Gn 41^{45}), and the second that of the chief steward of Pharaoh (Gn 39^{1}). Previous to the discovery of the stela it had always been recognized that the two Egyptian names in question in the Joseph story were not of the type known before the XXIst Dynasty, which type, incidentally, did not become at all frequent before the XXIInd Dynasty, say about the ninth and eighth centuries B.C., when the account of the Hebrew sojourn was put into writing in the form that we now know it. In other words, the original names of the persons concerned had long been lost, and so the compiler of the account naturally employed names which were in use in his own time.

Pedi-pa-Rê means, literally, 'He whom the god Rê hath given,' and is actually the name of the owner of the stela itself. The face of the stela is divided into two main registers, the upper one of which shows a figure of the god Osiris, the judge of the dead, with the unusual title 'spirit of his olive tree.' The pyramid texts of King Wenis of the Vth Dynasty inform us that the olive tree was sacred in Heliopolis. Compare also the parable in Jg $9^{8\text{ff.}}$: 'Once upon a time the trees set out to anoint a king over themselves; so they said to the olive tree, Reign over us.' Further, in Ps 52^{8}, we read of a 'green olive tree in God's house'; this seems to indicate that the olive tree was respected in the temple.

Behind Osiris on the stela is the figure of his divine wife Isis. Also in the upper register are representations of the members of the family of Pedi-pa-Rê with their names above them. It is important to note that one of the sons is called Ir-Ḥep-Iawt (literally, 'The god Apis makes old age') for this name is also met with on a stela of the XXIInd Dynasty in the Serapeum of Ṣaqqâra, and is therefore valuable to us for controlling the date of the Pedi-pa-Rê stela (cf. E. Chassinat, in *Recueil de Travaux*, xxii. 13). I leave it to Biblical scholars to discuss the actual bearing that the name of Pedi-pa-Rê, and the date of his stela, namely, about the XXIInd Dynasty, has upon the writing of the Joseph story in the Old Testament.

On the lower register of the Pedi-pa-Rê stela are four lines of hieroglyphics reading as follows: 'An offering which the king gives to Osiris, "the spirit of his olive tree," that he may give invocations of bread and beer, oxen and fowl, and all things good and pure on which a god lives, to the soul of the revered [Overseer of] the Storehouse of Ptaḥ, "who is under his olive tree," Pedi-pa-Rê, son of Ênkh-Ḥer . . . (most of the rest of text missing).' It will thus be seen that Pedi-pa-Rê was an overseer of the storehouse of the god Ptaḥ, who was also associated with an olive tree. Cf. H. Kees, in *Recueil de Travaux*, xxxvii. 60, 61, also Erman-Grapow, *Wörterbuch der Aegyptischen Sprache*, i. 423, iii. 389.

In concluding this section we may recall that of the other two Egyptian proper names in the Joseph story, the first, Asenath, the name of Joseph's wife, is from the Egyptian Nes-Net, 'She who belongs to the goddess Neith' (one of Pedi-pa-Rê's sons was actually called Pedi-Net, 'He whom the goddess Neith hath given'); and the second, Zaphenath-paneah, Joseph's Egyptian name, is probably from some as yet undiscovered name like Djed-pa-nether-iew-ef-ênkh, ‘The god spoke and he (the child) lived.’

‘Letter’ about Canaanite Well

During the last day or so I noticed in the King Fuâd collection a rather small oblong stone of black serpentine bearing the official name of Merenptaḥ I. of the XIXth Dynasty on one face, and the king’s personal name *Mer-en-Ptaḥ ḥetep-ḥer-maêt*, ‘Beloved of-Ptaḥ resting-upon-truth’ on the other face. On the two sides of the object is a text reading as follows: ‘Was found water in (or, Entered water into) the stone of the Well of *Mer-en-Ptaḥ ḥetep-ḥer-maêt* (*i.e.* King Merenptaḥ).’ The reason for the first part of the translation not being certain is because the upper part of the bird-hieroglyph representing the verb, meaning either ‘to find’ or ‘to enter,’ is broken away; but the rest of the text is quite clear. The question where this well can have been has now to be considered. First of all we must remark that in the famous stela set up in the fifth year of Merenptaḥ, in which among other peoples the Israelites are named, the king states, ‘the strongholds are left to themselves, *the wells are opened* (*again*).’ So we see that soon after Merenptaḥ I. came to the throne he opened up all the disused wells which had become blocked up by the foe, and it is to this very opening-up work that the text on our little stone must refer. We come much closer to fixing the locality named on the stone when we recollect the famous diary of a frontier official of some town on the Canaanite border who recorded the names and business of messengers who passed to and from Canaan in the reign of Merenptaḥ I. He writes: ‘Year three, first month of the third season, seventeenth day. There arrived the captains of the archers of the Well of *Mer-en-Ptaḥ ḥetep-ḥer-maêt* (*i.e.* King Merenptaḥ)—to whom be life, health, and strength—which is in the mountains, to report in the fortress which is in Tharew (near modern Qanṭara).’ The qualifying clause ‘which is in the mountains’ indicates that the well named in the official diary was somewhere in the highlands of Canaan. Incidentally, the word used for ‘mountain’ is *theset*, a word which is also employed elsewhere for two old Syrian geographical sites: ‘Mountains of Kadesh’ and ‘Mountains of the Coniferous Trees.’ As pointed out in my *Catalogue of Egyptian Scarabs, etc., in the Palestine Archæological Museum*, 1936, p. xxxii., par. 67, the ‘Well of Mer-en-Ptaḥ’ is perhaps identical with ‘the source of the waters of Nephtoah (=Mer-en-Ptaḥ?),’ of Jos 15^{9}, 18^{15}. Nephtoah has been equated with Lifta, near Jerusalem. It is not impossible that the well of our little stone and the well of the diary are identical, for I can find no other well of the king so specifically named. I suggest that the small inscribed serpentine stone was either a letter sent to the king of Egypt to announce the finding of water in the well (the ‘address’ being indicated by the cartouche containing the royal name), or even a tablet ‘struck’ in commemoration of the event.

Discovery of Alphabetic Writing in Scarab Texts

Ever since Egyptology has been in its infancy scholars have been puzzled as to the significance of the apparently meaningless groups of mixed signs on certain texts on scarabs and seals, these signs being generally regarded as of a more or less decorative nature or as sacred emblems of deities. For instance, one scarab contains the picture of a sceptre, a fish, a scorpion, and a lion, while another contains the pictures of a ram, a lion, and a lotus-bud, and so on. The usual values of these signs were, of course, well known; thus the sceptre is *was*; the lion, *rew*, and so forth. Having for a long time, but without success, tried to read by ordinary means some sense into the individual groups of mixed signs, I at last hit upon the idea of reading each group by acrophonic means, that is to say, by using only the *first* letter in each sign value. Thus the sceptre was read by me as *w* instead of *was*, the lion *r* instead of *rew*, and so on. The success of my idea was immediate, for I was able at once to read quite easily many of the hitherto puzzling groups of mixed signs on the scarabs and seals, dating from the end of the XVIIIth Dynasty to the Ptolemaic Era.

All of the groups I have so far deciphered contain names of deities, and it is quite clear to me that the newly discovered system of hieroglyphic writing on scarabs was made specially to conceal the names of gods. In this connexion we are reminded of Herodotus who, in his description of Egyptian embalming (Book ii. 85–88), states he must refrain from mentioning the name of the god; he, of course, refers to Osiris. The Hebrews also regarded the name of their Deity as too sacred for utterance. Among the names of the gods in the scarab texts just deciphered are Osiris, the judge of the dead; Amûn, the sun-god; and Ptaḥ or Ptaḥ-Tanen, the god of Memphis. But by far the majority of texts contains the name of the first-mentioned deity.

The significance of the new discovery lies much deeper, however, than the reading of the puzzling texts on scarabs and seals, for it actually means that we have come across the first general usage of the true alphabetic system of the ancient world, a system which extended from Egypt into Sinai, Palestine, and Syria. The alphabetic system of hieroglyphs itself certainly sprung from the enigmatic system of hieroglyphs which was evolved about the Middle Kingdom, but was not in more or less general use until the end of the XVIIIth Dynasty. In the latter system, hieroglyphs were given values quite different from what they usually had, or even occasionally given alphabetic values evolved on the acrophonic system; this system of writing containing *mixed* syllabic and alphabetic characters was employed for certain religious texts and the royal titulary of various kings.

For many long years scholars have been attempting to read all the so-called Sinaitic alphabetic scripts, which are certainly the common parent of the Phœnician, Hebrew, and Greek scripts. The former scripts existed in the mining region of Sinai during the XVIIIth and XIXth Dynasties (*when the alphabetic system was being evolved on our scarabs and seals*), and were clearly modelled on Egyptian hieroglyphs, being evolved from them, as Dr. A. H. Gardiner pointed out in 1916, by the acrophonic system. The Sinai scripts were probably originally used by the mixed Ægypto-Semitic peoples in the region who were employed in obtaining copper and turquoise for Egypt.

On talking over the newly discovered purely alphabetic system in the scarab texts with Mr. J. Leibovitch of the Cairo Museum, an expert in Sinaitic inscriptions, he at once suggested that it should be applied to the decipherment of the Sinaitic texts with a view to ascertaining whether anything could be made out of them, that is to say, by regarding the Sinaitic signs as containing not, as previously thought, mostly Semitic values, but Egyptian ones. Whatever may be the results of the attempted decipherment of the Sinaitic texts by the new trial method (and on which I have no opinion to offer), one thing seems fairly certain, and that is that the idea of the Semitic alphabet arose from the acrophonic system employed by the Egyptians to disguise the names of their gods, and so on.

Old Texts in Modern Translations.

Philippians i. 27 (Goodspeed).

By the Very Reverend Richard Roberts, D.D., Toronto.

I.

'Whatever happens, show yourselves citizens worthy of the good news of Christ. . . .' Of the new translations accessible to me at the moment, Goodspeed's alone preserves the flavour of the Pauline verb. It is true that πολιτεύω came to be used with no more than the slenderest reference to its original content; and it might be adequately rendered by such general expressions as 'to lead a life' or 'to behave,' though it was usually confined, in application, to the good life. In Ac 23[1], the verb in the perfect tense is rendered in A.V.: 'I have lived in all good conscience,' which seems to indicate that already the word was outliving its derivation. Thayer is no doubt right in saying that in late Hellenistic writings it meant no more than 'to conduct oneself as pledged to some law or standard.' Here, however, in the Philippian Epistle, the word cannot be altogether denuded of its original reference. St. Paul, the Roman citizen, was writing to his friends in Philippi, the Roman colony; and it is inconceivable that the idea of citizenship should be absent from his mind as he dictated the word πολιτεύεσθε. We have no means of knowing how many members of the Church in Philippi were Roman citizens; but they would all at least be aware of the importance which those who possessed it attached to their Roman citizenship. The noun corresponding to the verb occurs at Ph 3[20]; and Moffatt's brilliant paraphrase, 'We are a colony of heaven,' is undoubtedly justified; especially as πολίτευμα, which refers primarily to what we should describe as the 'state' was also used as synonymous with πολιτεία, the commonwealth or community. Under the circumstances, it seems a little strange that Moffatt should not have given πολιτεύεσθε more of its face-value in his rendering of 1[27]. It is perhaps not without its bearing on the matter in hand to recall that upon his visit to Philippi, St. Paul was charged with anti-Roman propaganda and cast into prison for it; but that he also, to the discomfiture of the local magistrates, effectually asserted the privileges of his own Roman citizenship.

The verb πολιτεύω, however, meant more than to assert, or to use, a political status. It meant behaving as a citizen should. On the analogy of the idiom 'play the man' we might fairly render it 'play the citizen.' It is something more than bare good behaviour. It is good behaviour of a particular kind. Good behaviour may be nothing more than negative behaviour, less virtue than abstention from vice, obeying the 'thou shalt nots' of the moral code. 'All these things,' said the rich young ruler, 'have I kept from my youth upward.' None the less, said Jesus, 'one thing thou lackest; go, sell all that thou hast and give to the poor.' But the young man went away sorrowful. So far as it went, his behaviour had been exemplary: but he did not and would not 'play the citizen.' To play the citizen is to live in and for a commonwealth, a community. He had no vices; but neither had he the graces of a citizen. His was, we may say, a negative character. But good citizenship calls for positive, sometimes for heroic virtues; and its specific distinction is devotion to a community.

It was, of course, the Christian community that St. Paul had in mind; and both πολιτεύω and πολιτευμα would suggest to his readers a graphic picture of themselves. Just as Philippi was a colony planted to assimilate the surrounding territory to the Roman Empire, so the Church in Philippi was a colony planted to assimilate the living world around it to the kingdom of Christ. The Roman colony, like its predecessor, the Greek, was in a real sense a missionary institution, intended to diffuse the life and peace of Rome in new territories added to the Empire—it has been said that the Roman civilization did not aim at the expansion of a race but at the diffusion of a culture. In like manner, the Church was a missionary community created to spread through the world the good tidings of the peace and the grace of God. Just as the Roman colony was, as it were, a spot of Rome in a foreign land, so the Church was a spot of heaven in a foreign world. Its primary concern was not with this world and its business, but with the unseen and the eternal; and its own business was to bring down from heaven the unseen and eternal powers which should bind its members together in a community of grace, and enable them to transform the Empire of Rome into an empire of that 'other King, one Jesus.'

II.

The Church is therefore at once the pattern, the nucleus, and the organ of a community which has no assigned frontiers, which was made for man, and apart from which man may not achieve his destiny. For us men, living means living together. Man, we are frequently told, is a social animal. But so is the bee and the wolf. The one has its hive, and the other his pack. But man was made not for the hive or the pack, though the Totalitarian State approximates to the former, and predatory 'big business' to the latter. Man was made for community, in which the individual is not subordinated to the group as in the hive, or the group subordinated to the individual as in the pack. Personality and community are correlative terms. The one implies and is unattainable without the other. In her remarkable but too little known book, *The New State*, Miss Mary Follett remarks that democracy is not so much a form of government as a way of living together. So it should be; and if democracy has not cut a very impressive figure in the modern world, it is because it has been altogether envisaged as a political order. But at the first, it was actually conceived as the ground of community; and the circumstance that it has fallen into some discredit may be traced, in great part at least, to the fact that it has not been provided with those ethical co-efficients for which its postulates called. Let it be recalled with what brave words on its lips democracy emerged in the modern world—Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, the sum of which is Community; and the words make as good a battle-cry to-day as they did in 1789. But there can be no liberty, except on the basis of a common obedience—the man who is a law unto himself will inevitably curtail his neighbour's liberty. Neither can there be equality except upon the basis of a common humility; nor fraternity save on the basis of mutual reverence and service. Obedience, humility, mutuality—these are the fundamental democratic virtues, and plainly they are the virtues that create community. πολιτεύεσθαι, is, in St. Paul's sense, the practice of these virtues.

It is hardly necessary to stress the importance of community, on any level of life. It is a universal experience that a wholesome sociability even on the less serious sides of life can add much to the sheer joy of living. It is hardly too much to say that sociability and sanity are inseparable. Our word *idiot* derives from the Greek word ἰδιώτης, which meant a private citizen; and I think it is Lightfoot who says that the opposite to πολιτεύεσθαι is ἰδιωτεύειν. But by now the notion of private-mindedness has associated itself so closely with the word that it signifies to us a person who has become incapable of normal and fruitful intercourse with his fellows. Chesterton once said that 'Hanwell' is full of people who believe in themselves. We are normal only as members of a community. This is no less true of the Christian man; the solitary unattached Christian is fated to become a religious crank. Life in community is essential to the health and growth of human personality.

Moreover, it is only in and through community that any high purpose can be accomplished or any creative enterprise can succeed in this world. Our Lord, when He found His Synagogue ministry frustrated in Galilee, immediately formed the twelve into a community, 'that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach'; and in doing so, He was obeying a universal human instinct. For, working together we reinforce one another; and a community closely knit together in pursuit of a common purpose can achieve an effectiveness greater than the sum of the effectiveness of the individuals who constitute it. Where there is community, two and two does not necessarily make four. It may conceivably make forty. The arithmetic of the spirit is not the arithmetic of the market-place.

III.

That St. Paul was concerned with the creation of community in this passage is clear from the context. He hopes to hear that his Philippians are 'standing fast in the same spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the gospel.' The essence of Christian community is a common experience and a common possession—nothing less than the grace of God in Jesus Christ. This is a common possession which transcends all differences whatsoever, a thing in itself so overwhelmingly great that they who possess it should be indissolubly one, a fellowship in which private pique or envy or any divisive temper should not be able to raise its head. Yet it is notorious how human frailty may disrupt fellowship. Even in Philippi, where the Church seems to have been unusually healthy, there was, at the time of St. Paul's writing, some internal friction. Two good women in the congregation had fallen out; and the Apostle beseeches Euodias and Syntyche to be of one mind in the Lord. In Christian community, the members should stand to one another in such a relation as God stands to them—a relation of grace. That should not only remove friction but should create a profound identity of interest. It is a good rule to mind one's own business; but it can be carried too far. One should have a friendly concern for his neighbour's business. 'Look not,' says St. Paul, 'every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others.' In true community, my business is yours; and yours is mine. We have in these times come, perhaps not inexcusably, to suspect the word 'communism'; but there is nothing wrong either with the word or the thing. What is wrong is the method used in order to secure the thing. There is a real communism which we must have if we are to have community—what we may describe as a communism of grace; and whether in the Church or the world without, if we had such communism of grace, we should resolve most of our troubles in our stride. It is peculiarly the office of the Church to attain to such a communism of grace, to that solidarity of mutual brotherly interest, and to diffuse it among mankind. For that is the only hope of the world.

The clue to the special character of the Christian ethic is, I believe, the doctrine of forgiveness—forgiveness, that is, in the sense of reconciliation, the restoration of a disrupted harmony. Into this matter, it is not possible here to pass beyond the threshold. The so-called 'hard-sayings' about turning the other cheek, giving the cloak with the coat, and going the second mile are simply logical developments of the doctrine of forgiveness, for they are instructions in the art of turning enemies into friends, that is to say, in the creation of community; and the following group of sayings concerning the loving of enemies bears the same character. In St. Paul's writings, the notion of community is the thread that gives unity to his ethical teaching, for example, Gal 6[1]: 'Even if a man be overtaken in a trespass, ye that are spiritual, restore such an one in a spirit of gentleness, looking to thyself, lest thou be tempted; bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfil the law of Christ.' Even what commonly is regarded as a particularly private virtue, *veracity*, St. Paul argues for on the ground of community. 'Speak ye truth each man with his neighbours, for ye are members one of another. Let him that stole steal no more, but rather let him labour, working with his hands the thing that is good that he may have whereof to give to him that hath need' (Eph 4[25. 28]). And once more, in Col 3[12-14], 'Put on therefore, as God's elect, holy and beloved, a heart of compassion, kindness, lowliness, meekness, long-suffering, forbearing one another and forgiving one another, if any man have a complaint against any. And above all things, put on love which is the bond of perfectness.' St. Paul would have said that πολιτεύεσθαι consists in the practice of κοινωνία.

IV.

In the Philippian context St. Paul lays special stress upon *humility*. 'Let nothing be done through strife or vainglory, but in lowliness of mind, let each esteem other better than themselves.' And almost immediately, he launches into the great Kenosis passage. 'Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus . . . who took upon him the form of a servant . . . humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.' In his emphasis on humility, St. Paul was following his Master. There is a story in the Gospels which tells how Jesus at a dinner-party, read a little lecture on table-manners to His fellow-guests. There had been an unseemly scramble for places at the head-table. When at last the guests were seated, Jesus with a quiet irony warned them against the danger of social pushfulness, namely, the mortifying experience of being consigned to a less conspicuous place. He suggests that even a show of humility might be a safer and more rewarding policy. Jesus knew that it was vain to expect a company of 'social climbers' to take kindly to a serious counsel of humility; but perhaps a little irony might mend their manners. The essential point, however, was that there is no authentic sociability, still less grace, where men are greedy of social pre-eminence. It is a man's part to be humble, for humility is actually the effect of honest and intelligent self-assessment. Not only is it that a man does not think more highly of himself than he ought to think, but that he also does not think more meanly of himself than he ought to think, for he was made in the image of God. The word *humility* is derived from the Latin *humus*, and might have meant, at first, a grovelling person: and the change in the status of the word and the thing is one of the revolutions which the Christian gospel has worked. We may fairly, I think, retain the derivation by saying that humility should suggest a realist, a man who has his feet on the ground, where they should be. A man should respect his manhood; but he should not exaggerate his importance. He should be humble; and where humility is, there is also grace; and accordingly a genuine community. That is true anywhere; but in the Christian community it should be a commonplace. Turgeniev in one of his novels says that the whole significance of life lies in taking the second place—and humility is simple willingness to take the second place.

V.

It is part of 'playing the citizen' to expand the area as well as to improve the quality of community. An invitation reached the present writer some little time ago, to deliver an address upon the question, *Has Christianity an international policy?* Had it been possible for him to do so, he would have answered the question with a plain Yes; and then would have gone on to say that the first article of that policy is: '*Go ye therefore, and teach all nations . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.*' That, the charter of Christian missions, is also the charter of a community in Christ as wide as the world. In the end there are just two international policies: the policy of force or the policy of grace. To-day we are seeing that the policy of force is well on the way to become a policy of race-suicide; and the one serious effort to introduce a small modicum of the policy of grace into the international field, the League of Nations, has proved helpless in the face of aggressive 'power-politics.' But the League of Nations suffered from a trouble which afflicts all of us: it inherited a grievous burden of original sin from its begetters, the authors of the Versailles Treaty. It was disastrously handicapped from the start. But that is no reason for throwing up our hands and quitting the field. This is, of all times, the time for Christian folk and Christian churches to double and redouble the provision for the preaching of the gospel among all nations. Every missionary in China and Japan is an ambassador of the world-community that is to be; and they are even now laying the foundations of a brotherhood of grace in the Far East. We may not live to see that brotherhood; but its coming is as sure as the morrow's dawn. The only open question is when it will come; and that depends upon our fidelity in 'playing the citizen.' For us, as for the Lord who died for us, and who broke down the middle wall of partition in his own day, there should be no frontiers; the foreigner is our brother for whom Christ died. We who have heard the good news of God cannot be exempted from the honourable obligation to pass the news along to the last man on earth; and now, in this ominous crisis of the world, more than ever, comes to us the call, which we cannot evade without perfidy, to take up with renewed faith the burden of pushing out the frontiers of the community of grace to the uttermost ends of the earth.

Christianity in Action.

The Church and the Oxford Group.

By the Very Reverend Ebenezer Macmillan, D.D., Pretoria.

What is this new thing which is known all over the world and is vitally at work in more than forty countries, which began in the life of one man some thirty years ago, and was brought to South Africa by a team of six Oxford students and one Hollander; which, for that reason, was named by the South African Press, *the Oxford Group*?

It is contagious Christianity. It passes from individual to individual. It has no organization, no president, secretary or paid officials, and no affiliation dues. One cannot join it. One is either in it or out of it, according as one accepts or refuses the challenge of the standards of absolute honesty, purity, unselfishness, and love, and is prepared to live in a fellowship of guided sharing and disciplined obedience. It has no special method of working, only friendship and a love that takes responsibility. It is not a new religion; it is not even a new secret. It is an open secret. The late Provost of Queen's College, Oxford, said that 'he had thrown in his lot with the Oxford Group because they had discovered the secret of making bad people good and good people better more rapidly and on a more international scale than any other movement.' On another occasion, Dr. Streeter said, in the presence of many of his colleagues: 'In an age of growing despair I feel it to be my duty to associate myself with a movement which seems to have got on to the secret of giving new hope and new courage, and of increasing the number of men of goodwill in the world.'

The Bible says that we are saved by hope. It is the first condition of being helped. God will forgive us everything but our despair. Moody used to say that he searched the Bible from Genesis to Revelation and he never could find God doing anything with discouraged people. Any movement that brings hope in an age of despair must be born of the Holy Spirit. God began this movement and it is under His control.

It is a spiritual revolution, dealing with the fundamental sources of decadence, indiscipline, and ineffectiveness, and showing a way to national renewal through ordinary men realizing that God can change and use them in bringing to the birth a new social order. We use the word 'revolution' advisedly, for, as Generalissimo and Madame Chiang Kai-shek said in a special message to *Rising Tide*, 'The regeneration of the country has become our national aim, possible only through the spiritual renewal of the people. The challenge of the Oxford Group to rebuild society on the simple, unassailable foundations of individual honesty, sincerity, and selflessness is the challenge for a Christian revolution.' Another spiritual leader has said: 'The need of the nations is for true patriots with a personal experience of Jesus Christ, who will bring about the greatest revolution of all time, whereby the Cross of Christ will transform the world.' Others not identified with the Oxford Group are of the same view. President Roosevelt said recently: 'I doubt if there is any problem, social, political, or economic, that would not melt before the fire of a spiritual awakening.'

Church leaders throughout Christendom share the same conviction. The Archbishop of Canterbury has issued a 'Recall to Religion.' Ministers of religion are growing anxious over the symptoms of decay and neglect that are everywhere manifest. Materializing forces have got hold of us, and we have already vastly changed in society, in the Church, and in every department of the nation's life. It is like an atmosphere; it has seeped in. The trend of modern thinking is towards naturalism and scientific humanism. The supernatural is discounted, if it has not vanished from the atmosphere of contemporary religious life. Good people accept the miracles of science without question, and there is an emotional thrill akin to worship when men come to speak of them. But supernatural happenings in the sphere of religion are critically, if not unfavourably, examined. 'Religion,' they say, 'is all very well, provided it is not too disturbing or too demanding.' 'Thank God, we have religion well under control in this institution,' was the remark of one of the staff of a Missionary Institute, which I had occasion to visit. It was typical of our own attitude before religion became a reality, and supernatural happenings the daily bread of Christian experience. 'We did not want to use the raw material of experience more than was necessary; it was too crude. And, if some one did burst in on us with a story of great personal deliverance, we were dubious, if not offended, unless it could be proved that it happened along the approved lines of our own sacramental teaching.'[1] We never dreamed that to be supernatural was the normal way of living—the way of absolute simplicity, unself-consciousness and defencelessness. Prejudices in which we used to find our security and pedestals to which we trusted for our dignity have had to go. We find ourselves in a fellowship which, while it does not take us for granted, is unsurpassed for depth of love and trust and understanding. It is a sharing fellowship, only possible to those who have surrendered those sins of separateness, that lie hidden under so many disguises in our inmost natures, to which as has been said, 'religious people perhaps are especially prone'[2]—a fellowship in which we are committed to Christ and to one another without reserve, in which we can live and act creatively together. This is the only way to real collective spiritual action, and the Fellowship is the result of it. This is the real meaning of fellowship—a shared activity, a shared enterprise. What more wonderful enterprise could there be than the changing of the world—to be able to go in the name and spirit of such a fellowship as this into any situation, no matter how desperate, with courage and hope and, above all, the power to help in the deepest way? This is what the world needs. This is what the world has in this movement of the Holy Spirit.

But some will say 'This is just what the Church exists everywhere to do.' Exactly. Those are the words used by the Archbishop of Canterbury: 'The Group Movement is most certainly doing what the Church of Christ exists everywhere to do. It is changing human lives.' It is the one thing the Group is out for—changing lives and changing life. When lives are changed, whole situations, domestic and business are changed. This is as it should be. D. L. Moody once said: 'I have no patience with any man's religion that does not straighten out his relations with his fellow-men.' A big chain-store merchant in Canada gets changed and it means a better economic deal for his thousands of workers. Change those who have the means and the power to effect a change in business and industrial conditions and you have the answer to every problem that faces commerce or industry. For the problem of industry is the problem of the men who compose it. Only as a new spirit comes to men can a true destiny come to industry. This is the real industrial revolution.

So the Group goes all out on life-changing. It believes that man in his natural state needs redemption and that it is futile to try to change human conditions of living without at the same time changing human nature. An English statesman has said: 'To expect a change in human nature may be an act of faith; but to expect a change in human society without it is an act of lunacy.' How far are we in the Church committed to this conviction, and how far do we go all out on it? Or how far are our own lives, for the most part, illustrations of enlightened humanism? The fact must be faced that many of our people are not really Christian. Samuel Butler in *The Way of all Flesh*, says, in his biting way, that some Church members would be 'equally horrified at hearing the Christian religion doubted as they would be at seeing it practised!' Real, revolutionary Christianity would, doubtless, be very disturbing. It would revolutionize our whole missionary and Church extension policy. New churches are certainly needed for the people, but the far greater need is new people for the churches. We have to face the fact that so many things done in and by the Church are and can be done without God. Perhaps our greatest sin is independence of the Living God.

The Group insists on absolute surrender to God's control. The general tendency in a humanistic age is towards self-effort, acting before God has a chance to act, anticipating the Holy Spirit. It is a common fault among men of energy and ambition. Real team-work in a fellowship of those who are absolutely committed to one another and whose duty it is to challenge one another in love, would be the greatest safeguard against this tendency towards individualism. It is the team spirit that is one of the distinguishing features of the Group, and, of course, it is only possible in a sharing fellowship; that is, a fellowship in which each is absolutely available to the other, with no reserve. To refuse to be available to any in the fellowship, or to any outside it who is in need of help, is sin. Sin is anything which prevents one from being of fundamental use to his fellow. It is, of course, much more than that; but, it is at least that. It is well to be concrete about sin, as about other realities. The moment one ceases to be concrete one ceases to be real. Perhaps our greatest need is to have a new sense of sin and of redemption. Certainly, our greatest need as ministers is 'not ardour to serve men, but courage to face God with our souls as we are'—and, to do so, in the presence of one other, some understanding soul, who will hold us up to the challenge of the Holy Spirit, that in a new and witnessed way we may win the power which can serve men to the uttermost.

---

[1] *Vide* article by Lady Fletcher, in *The Guardian*, 20th December 1935.

[2] *Ibid.*

Clearly, the power can come from God alone, but it comes on conditions which will mean the breaking of all human pride. Professor Mowinckel has said that 'Sharing is the secret of the Oxford Group; sharing is the secret of helping others.' It is true. It is the condition of all real spiritual collective action; it is the condition of revolutionary living. Our Lord was revolutionary. He wanted His followers to be the same. Good as was the old wine, He Himself thought the new wine of the Kingdom better. He was all for the new wine type of discipline, even if it did burst the old wine-skin. The Church will be revolutionary when it has the courage of its own gospel. It was Principal Rainy, the Church historian, who said: 'The Church moves forward not by evolution but by revival.' He might have said, by revolution. This is the Church that is needed for a world in revolution.

The Group is witness to what happens when men go all out on God's plan for the world and under the guidance of His Spirit. Miracles have happened in the lives of individuals who had grown inward through nursing some old grudge or resentment; a sudden explosion blowing up the root of bitterness, and a new love and a new sense of responsibility taking its place. The same has happened in situations; domestic situations that could only end in divorce, resulting in a change of relationship and a renewal of trust. Difficult business situations, verging on bankruptcy and dissolution, have suddenly cleared up. It has happened and is happening in race-relationships, and surely we in South Africa have had our bitter share of race antagonism! It was General Smuts, who said to the present writer, when he first heard how the Group message was breaking down the barriers between the English and Afrikaans-speaking South Africans, and how in this fellowship both sections of the white race were co-operating in building up a new order of society and taking also a new responsibility for the welfare of the native and coloured races: 'Go ahead; if this is true, it will mean an end to our racial curse.' It has been happening on the farms—British and Afrikander farmers, hating one another as neighbours, refusing to share what one enjoyed in abundance and the other lacked and brought to the verge of bankruptcy, suddenly reconciled and now co-operative and progressive. There is no limit to which this spirit of revolutionary change can go into the heart of the nation's life. It is really an answer to the question—'Am I my brother's keeper?'

The Group is showing so clearly the meaning of taking responsibility for others. At a recent house party a professor of economics was changed, and he startled the assembly by a saying that seemed at first strange, but which is really in line with our Lord's teaching: 'True morality is the capacity for taking responsibility.' One's mind immediately connected the saying with our Lord's dealing with the Scribes and Pharisees, the good and regular Church-going people of His time. It was to them He spoke the parables of the lost sheep and lost son, not to the sinners to convince them of their lostness; it was to arouse the Pharisees to a sense of responsibility for the lost. It was as if He said—'Come in and help Me, with your splendid moral record, to reclaim the wandering and the lost; and in doing so you will find new life, a new and creative moral life—a capacity for taking responsibility.'

Surely this is the normal way of renewal for the Church. We hear a lot about evangelism and the need for it. It has been discussed at Assemblies and at Conferences. Books have been written about it, and the Church is being told that it is the only hope of revival. But is revival the objective? Surely something much more revolutionary than revival is needed if the ultimate objective be to change the world. Revival is not enough even to quicken the Church, which is the immediate objective; not simply the ministry but the laity. We must mobilize all our resources for the task. The professional ministry, even if changed, could never do it. The whole Church to the last man and woman must be claimed, and to this end must be changed and trained. 'If we liberated the lay forces of Christianity,' said Dr. John R. Mott, 'we should find ourselves in a new spiritual order.'

The Group has no cut-and-dried plan for changing the world. It only knows that the world is sick unto death and cannot be made well along the ordinary lines of the average Christian ministry or the commonly accepted methods of evangelism. It was the late Dr. James Denney who said that the Church of his time was busy stirring the fire when it should have been mending it. During a special evangelistic effort, there is a flare up, but after it dies down, the fire is lower than it was before it was stirred. Only as lives are being changed in such a way that they, in turn, become life-changing, can there be continuous creative forces at work to replenish the resources of spiritual power. It has been found possible only through the power of the Living Christ in a sharing fellowship, so deep, and so demanding, so free from the spirit of reproach or blame, so full of real appreciation, understanding sympathy and upholding love, so devoid of the old solemnity and piousness, and so full of fun and freedom, because released from all that used to inhibit and repress our religious life in most unnatural ways, making our religion the only unnatural thing about us.

This is simply a record of facts and happenings. It is not concerned with the growth of a movement or the popularizing of a particular method or point of view. It is a statement of conviction shared in by a great multitude of responsible people in many nations that God has raised this instrument for the challenge of the Church and for the quickening of a supernational renaissance of the Spirit, which, as all admit, is the fundamental need.

The Group is out to help the Church. It knows that it needs the Church, which is its only organization. No less does the Church need the Group. It meets the outside pagan world without prejudice, and is able to intrigue those who have no time for the Church. These pagans, when changed, have as their first thought the joining of the Church. Is the average church ready to receive them or to offer them creative fellowship? Surely the bringing in of them that are without ought to mean the quickening of them that are within! One of the ablest of the younger Independent ministers in England said recently: ‘The real tragedy about the Oxford Group is that it is there or is needed at all. What the Oxford Group does for men, the Churches ought to be doing as part of their normal job. They ought to provide a fellowship in which God is felt to be so real and the Christian standards so binding and actual that they would almost automatically convince youth of their reality.’ Is it so? Whether we like it or not, this is one of God’s ways of action. It is not enough to believe in God; we must identify ourselves with God *in action*. We must not cavil at the form of action He chooses to take. We may not even like the results of His action, yet that is not going to hinder or modify His action. Moses did not approve of all God’s ways or acts, yet, ‘He made known his ways unto Moses, his acts unto the children of Israel.’

God is always choosing the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty. One has only to read *Rising Tide*, the latest publication of the Oxford Group, to realize the mighty force and influence of this movement of the Holy Spirit; and where the Holy Spirit is, there is the Church. ‘I want to stress the growing conviction,’ declared Dr. John Mackay, President of Princeton Theological Seminary, ‘that something tremendous is happening in the world through this movement . . . it has made the Church aware of responsibility. It is not divisive. It is working through the medium of the Church. The Living God is on the march!’

It is the Church on the march—the Church in action. It is for us to identify ourselves with *God in action*, and we shall see greater things than these. The tide is only beginning to rise. ‘The golden age of Church history lies ahead. The day of the renewal of the Church—something far beyond what our prayers for revival even contemplated is at hand. Men and women have dedicated themselves to bring their homes, their business, their country under God’s control. This is the Church, and it is an army on the march. The Church will become young again, as she leads the world in spiritual revolution.’

So writes the Bishop of Rangoon in a leading article to the *Church of England Newspaper*. It is a vision shared by a multitude, who are seeing the glory of the coming of the Lord. We shall see days so vital and fresh in spiritual power and on so wide a scale as will make the days of the Reformation or the Evangelical Revival seem parochial. We are already seeing it—God rending the heavens and coming down and taking full control of men’s hearts and lives and using them for His own world purposes. We shall cease to engage in ‘the costless celebration of past revivals,’ realizing that we are in the midst of a spiritual revolution that is shaking the things that are shakable in order that the things that are unshakable may remain. We must be very simple and very humble and very ready to listen and obey, and to say with the great Apostle at the beginning of his Christian career: ‘Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?’ When man listens God speaks.

In *Rising Tide*, after the story in pictures of God’s miraculous action in the world, there is, on the last page, a lovely picture of a child with hand uplifted and outstretched, eager, as children in school, to give the answer to teacher’s question. Underneath are the words—‘I know the answer.’ ‘Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.’

Recent Foreign Theology.

Christ.[1]

THE antithesis between the Jesus of history and Christ, the distinction between a religion of Jesus and a religion about Jesus, and the ingenious attempt to show how the Apostle Paul made a redemptive religion out of some simple teaching put forward by a saintly artisan in Galilee—these are to-day withered leaves in the book of criticism. Professor Seeberg notes in his pamphlet how the serious centre of scholarship is occupied with Jesus as the Lord, the incarnate God, the Son of Man, or the Word. This is the only historical clue to the Primitive Church as reflected in the variety of the New Testament writings, and he argues it is still the explanation of all Christian Churches in their manifold positions. 'What is common to the Christian Churches is not the Word, nor Tradition, but faith in the Incarnation.' Towards the close he reveals a pressing application of this to the German environment. The chief category for Jesus was not the Jewish Messiah, he contends, but the Son of Man, which was an Aryan idea, involving the thought of Christ as the ideal and prototype for mankind; he concludes by affirming that the Church and Christianity 'are much less inwardly connected with the ideology of democracy than with many of the ideas and conceptions which National Socialism propounds and desires to realize.'

St. Paul's Metaphors.[2]

This is a conscientious young scholar's survey of the figurative language used by the Apostle, *i.e.* of similes, proverbial expressions, and particularly metaphors. It contains a number of useful references to current criticism, but any discussion of such a problem requires a literary training which goes far beyond the power of dredging dictionaries, and Herr Straub does not exhibit this essential power of judging the diction of a classical author. Thus the paragraphs on Paul's use of 'body' as a corporate term need to be filled out from his deep religious belief in Christ as well as from current Stoic language. However, so far as the monograph goes, it is helpful as a guidebook to the data upon which exegesis works.

Sermons on St. Augustine.

In a manuscript of the tenth century, which originally belonged to Monte Cassino but is or was recently in the Madrid National Library, M. C. Lambot has discovered what seem to be seven authentic sermons or expositions of Scripture by St. Augustine, hitherto unknown. The Bishop of Hippo was a copious preacher. He would sometimes preach more than once a week, and at times daily; his addresses were taken down in shorthand as a rule by some eager listener. It is interesting that the first three in this little collection are on the gospel and the Gospels, and some account of them is published by the discoverer in the *Revue Bénédictine* (1937, pp. 233–278). The first of them is on 'Peter's Love,' the text being the last chapter of St. John's Gospel. The preacher gives the usual interpretation of Mt 16^{18}: 'Christ built the Church, not on man but on Peter's confession. What is Peter's confession? "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God." There is the rock (petra), there is the foundation.' He had already quoted St. Paul's word about God's people of old: 'they drank of the spiritual Rock ("Petra") which followed them, and that Rock was Christ,' adding 'So the disciple "Peter" comes from "Petra," as "Christian" from Christ.' The second discourse, delivered at some unidentified place called Tuneba, is on patience first of all. The third is on Lk 12$^{13-15}$, addressed evidently to a congregation mainly composed of poor folk. 'You are poor and yet you make up a church. How so, if you are poor, except that you are rich in soul.' There is nothing in these fresh sermons which is unfamiliar to students of the great African bishop, but they are most interesting as specimens of his practical, popular preaching.

JAMES MOFFATT.

New York.

* * *

THIS[3] is an exceptionally important, interesting, and able book, and I have seldom read a book with so keen appreciation and, for the most part, so close agreement. It deserves strenuous study, and it requires it, for its closely knit argument, and its many explanatory notes do not make the reading always easy. The sub-title indicates that the theoretical discussion subserves the practical purpose. The author believes that the Church should not stand apart, or hold itself aloof from the community or nation (*Volk*) where God has appointed its lot. Accordingly he seeks to show that it is the one God who creates, redeems, and completes the world; in opposition to the Barthian theology he maintains that there is a general revelation of God in Nature and history as God's continuous creation, and that by the fall into sin man has not entirely lost the divine image, but retains so much of his likeness to God as to be able to receive the divine revelation, general and special. He is, however, careful to insist that it is no *natural theology* he is advocating, man's discovery by reason of God in the world, but God's self-disclosure to the faith of man.

---

[1] Professor Erich Seeberg, *Wer ist Christus?* (Mohr, Tübingen; M.1.50).

[2] Herr Werner Straub, *Die Bildersprache des Apostels Paulus* (Mohr, Tübingen; M.7.80).

[3] *Die Kirche und die Schöpfung. Eine theologische Besinnung zu dem Dienst der Kirche an der Welt,* von Eugen Gerstenmaier (Furche-Verlag, Berlin; M.6.60 and 7.80).

In man's self-consciousness as creature there is implicit the knowledge of God as Creator of the world; in the moral conscience of man 'the law written in the heart' there is also the divine self-disclosure. The third chapter on Nature and history contains a subtle argument on the correlation of world-totality and world unity, causality and teleology, space and time, Nature and history, condition, structure moment (*Gestaltmoment*), structure which will delight those who can breathe the rarified air of abstractions, but may be 'caviare to the general' reader. The purpose is to prove that in history too God is creating and so revealing Himself; in it liberty and community are correlatives; it expresses the order of creation. This argument leads up to the discussion of the conception which is so dominant in German thought, one can almost say has become an idol—*das Volk*—the people or the nation. 'The State is the form of action in which a people exists independently in history' (p. 91). Hence there is something abnormal when several peoples are subject to one State, or one people exists in groups in other states. This may seem an application to Germany; but at p. 31 the author warns against the error of regarding single events as divine revelation. What is significant, however, is that he ends this first part on the *World as Creation* with the people and the State, and does not go beyond.

In the second part, dealing with *Creation and Sin*, he seeks to offer a more modern interpretation of the primitive condition of man, the first full, original sin, than do the Protestant confessions; into the details here it is not necessary to follow him. But a few sentences may be quoted to show his standpoint. 'If a man knows that he is a creature, he also knows the totality from which he lives. Where he knows himself as sinner, he recognizes this connexion also in his guilt. He knows that his sin is no private affair. His sin affects the community, in which he is created, in which he lives. It brings guilt in this community in that it subjects it to the disturbing action of his sin. It is true that the responsibility rests on the guilty, and yet he makes partners in guilt, who themselves thereby become guilty. . . . Only as my own deed is the sin of the world my guilt' (p. 157).

The third part on the *Church and Creation* is the most attractive part. The Church is the new creation, completing the old; in Christ's resurrection the new order begins, for, while still the Church is *ecclesia crucis*, it is also the *ecclesia militaris*, and will in the end be the *ecclesia triumphanes*. The section on the work of the Church in the old creation, in history, again reverts to the German situation. The author recognizes that the gospel must be addressed to individuals; but he advocates the conception of the *Volkskirche*, the Church which will include in its membership and ministers all citizens who do not expressly exclude themselves. Its reference then is as wide as that of the State; but its objective is different; although the respective functions of both are rooted in God's order of creation. The author repudiates the assumption made in œcumenical discussions that the *Totalitarian State* is essentially in conflict with the truth for which the gospel stands. His most important statement is in a note on p. 266. The decisive question is not what is the dependence of the individual on the State, but are the ideas of the State contrary to what the Church stands for? A secondary consideration is, whether it is, or is not, totalitarian, if it does not conflict with what constitutes the Christian community. Even if it identifies itself with and proclaims a world-view, this conclusion stands. Only when an absolute claim is made, in which a myth is expressed, must the Church combat it. While he expresses his indebtedness to Bishop Heckel, who has been the agent of the German Christian policy, his book contains no trace of the paganizing tendency of some members of that party. He seems to hold himself aloof from the Church controversy. In dealing with the Church's service to the world, he separates its cure of souls from political action.

The last section deals with the Kingdom of God. He places it in the future as the act of God, which will end history, pronounce judgment, and usher in the blessedness of the saved. While he seems to suggest 'eternal torment' for the wicked, damned in their past, deprived of the eternal future (p. 279), he is content elsewhere to declare the hope of universal restoration an illegitimate doctrine (p. 285). Nowhere does he show any sympathy with 'the larger hope.' The division into three parts is on a trinitarian basis—God as Creator, Redeemer, and Completer. From the previous argument, one might have hoped that the climax of his argument would have been a completion universal as the Creation and Redemption. A. E. Garvie.

London.

Entre Nous.

A Seventeenth-Century 'Manual for Ministers.'

It might, perhaps, be a counsel of perfection to suggest that every minister should make time once a year to read George Herbert's *A Priest to the Temple, or, The Country Parson, his Character and Rule of Holy Life.* Yet no one who adopted this practice in as devout a spirit as that in which Herbert wrote could fail to find his conscience searched and his zeal renewed. Izaak Walton said of the work that it was so full of prudent and useful rules that there was no excuse for the country parson who could spare twelve pence and did not possess it.

The Preface makes plain why Herbert wrote the book, and affords any man sufficient reason why he should read it. 'I have resolved to set down the form and character of a true pastor that I may have a mark to aim at, which also I will set as high as I can.' A pastor is defined at once as 'the deputy of Christ for the reducing of man to the obedience of God.' He is 'in God's stead to his parish.' It is an office which demands careful preparation, and it is in itself a continual training school for the true man, for all are warned, 'not to think that when they have read the fathers or schoolmen, a minister is made and the thing done. The greatest and hardest preparation is within.' When that preparation is complete and successful, it produces a man who is 'exceeding exact in his life, being holy, just, prudent, temperate, bold, grave, in all his ways.'

Herbert has no illusions about the nature of the life which the Country Parson will be called upon to live, and he has none either about the people among whom he will labour. He knows how hard country people have to labour. They are a conservative folk and must be humoured: 'The Country Parson is a lover of old customs, because country people are much addicted to them, so that to favour them therein is to win their hearts, and to oppose them therein is to deject them.' They are recognized as not very spiritually minded. 'The Country Parson, considering the great aptness country people have to think that all things come by a kind of natural course . . . labours to reduce them to see God's hand in all things.' They display the typical peasant vice of meanness: 'Country people are full of petty injustices, being cunning to make use of another and spare themselves.' The last weakness of his people we may mention is their readiness to take offence. It is the parson's duty to invite his people to dine with him in turn, and he takes extreme care to see that all have their turn, 'because country people are very observant of such things, and will not be persuaded but, being not invited, they are hated.'

Herbert would prefer his minister to be unmarried, yet his wise and understanding spirit (and, possibly, his own happy marriage) will not allow him to lay down any hard and fast law. In whichever state, married or unmarried, he feels called to live, he will exercise himself therein with such discipline of prayer and fasting as to avoid all indulgence, and so keep 'his body tame, serviceable, and healthful, and his soul fervent, active, young, and lusty as an eagle.' If he marries, 'the choice of his wife was made rather by his ear than by his eye: his judgment, not his affection, found out a fit wife for him.' His household is to be a model for the parish. All who compose it are diligent in work, and often in prayer. No details are to be too small for consideration, for the man will be revealed by all that pertains to him. His dress, for example, must be plain, 'reverend and clean, without spots or dust or smell; the purity of his mind breaking out and dilating itself even to his body, clothes, and habitation.'

That the Country Parson must be educated goes without saying. His knowledge will be, first and foremost, of the Bible. 'There he sucks and lives.' This knowledge he diligently cultivates by living blamelessly, praying constantly, searching the Scriptures, and using good commentaries. 'He hath one comment at least upon every book of Scripture, and ploughing with this and his own meditations, he enters into the secrets of God treasured in the holy Scripture.' His studies will be wisely directed at all times, because even they have their perils. 'Curiosity in prying into high, speculative, and unprofitable questions is a great stumbling-block to the holiness of scholars.'

Among the public duties of the parson preaching holds high place. The relevant section opens with a flourish of trumpets. 'The Country Parson preacheth constantly: the pulpit is his joy and his throne.' He spares no effort or art in presenting his message effectively and bringing it home personally to his hearers, 'but the character of his sermon is holiness: he is not witty, nor learned, nor eloquent, but holy.' The texts will not be controversial but moving and ravishing ones in which Scripture abounds. They are to be expounded in a straightforward manner, and the sermon will not last more than an hour.

Visiting his flock brings the minister a whole host of opportunities. Then he finds his people as they are, and in every case will commend or correct, reprove or reward. He will catechize, hear confessions, and give ruling on the nicer points of conscience. 'After a man is once a minister, he cannot agree to come into any house where he shall not exercise what he is, unless he forsake his plough and look back.' He will go to rich and poor alike, 'into the poorest cottage, though he even creep into it, and though it smell never so loathsomely.'

Many as are the duties, serious and reverend as must be the carriage of the Country Parson, it is allowed that at times he must relax, 'knowing that nature will not bear everlasting droopings.' So 'he condescends to human frailties both in himself and others, and intermingles some mirth in his discourses occasionally.' Happily we know that George Herbert himself found great relaxation and refreshment in music, and he justified his indulgence by saying, 'Religion does not banish mirth but only moderates it.'

Taking the book as a whole, its careful prudence would smack of the Law, were it not for the devout and gentle spirit of the author which breathes through the driest counsel. We know he is but commending to others what he himself proved in practice. Izaak Walton in his short life of Herbert tells that when he was inducted to the living of Bemerton, he was, as the Law required, shut in the Church alone to toll the bell. He stayed so long that friends drew near and looked through the windows. They saw George Herbert prostrate in prayer before the altar. He afterwards told a friend that 'he set some rules to himself for the future manage of his life, and then and there made a vow to labour to keep them.' There was nothing selfish about the end he had in view. It was not a desire to win for himself the respect of men, nor was it over-concern about his own salvation, which inspired him. He lived according to rule, as he said, 'that my humble charitable life may so win upon others as to bring glory to my Jesus.' They are safe who take the best of his counsels if they share the purity of his motives.

John Wilding.

Birmingham.

Printed by **Morrison & Gibb Limited**, Tanfield Works,
and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street,
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings
Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Where do we stand to-day in regard to the authenticity of the Gospel narratives? Obviously that is a vital question, as our faith has a historical basis. It is not a matter of 'spiritual values,' or of ideas, that are independent of the solid earth of history. We must know where we are in the region of historical assurance. This is the point raised and discussed in *The Gospels in the Making*, by the Rev. Alan Richardson, Vicar of Cambo (S.C.M.; 5s. net). It is a very able book, with a fairly decided modernist tendency. But the author knows his subject, and moves about in it with complete mastery. And if we sometimes feel that he yields too readily to suggestions from the left, we may have perfect confidence in both his honesty and his competence.

The first thing to note is that for the past hundred years criticism of the Gospels has been *literary* criticism. It has dealt with the written sources. And we may affirm that it has reached conclusions which are accepted almost universally. These are that the earliest written sources known to us are Q, which may be dated about A.D. 50, and Mark, which may be put at A.D. 65. Both 'Matthew' and Luke used these two sources. They also used other material, the nature and origin of which we may guess at, with more or less probability, but without any certainty.

This seems a fairly solid ground of confidence. But there is something else to be taken into account. If we fix the approximate date of the Crucifixion at A.D. 30, it is plain that nearly a generation elapsed between the date of the Crucifixion and our earliest written narratives. What happened in these twenty or thirty years? That is the question to which criticism has recently been addressing itself. We may easily account for the absence of written records during these years. For one thing, the belief of the early Christians that the Return of the Lord was imminent would discourage the collection of narratives. And for another thing, the members of the Early Church were poor, many of them probably illiterate, and writing and writing material were costly, so costly that books were often owned not by an individual but by a community.

Now this gap between the Crucifixion and Q and Mark was the creative period in the formation of Christian tradition—the stories about Jesus circulated in oral form. And though the memory of an unliterary people and age is tenacious, and though teaching and learning were by memorizing (both these things are true), yet it is hardly likely that the tradition was not modified, enlarged, to some extent shaped, in its transmission. Even in the literary period a good deal of liberty was used by those who wrote down the gospel story. We can see this from the way Matthew and Luke handle Mark. They select, edit, rearrange, omit or expand parts of their sources.

The problem, then, is how the tradition received the form it has in the Gospels. This is the problem which is examined in what is now known as 'Form Criticism.' It concentrates on the pre-literary age and on the 'form' which the oral tradition assumed, and why it assumed this form. It ought to be evident that in this region we are treading upon very uncertain ground. For we have no direct evidence. All our information is from literary sources. And any conclusions can only be by inference, which may or may not be probable. Form critics have to be on their guard against undue and unfounded dogmatism.

There are certain conclusions, however, which may be accepted without much doubt. It is highly probable that the tradition received its form at first from preachers and teachers. And they must have had certain needs in view. One was the need of illustration to make the message clear. Stories and selections from the teaching of Jesus would be an essential part of the equipment of both missionaries and catechists. The second need was for guidance about practical everyday problems of conduct. Christ's sayings about divorce and the tribute money would be of great practical help. The third need was of polemic, of arguments that could be used against Greek and Jewish controversialists. Christ's sayings about the Sabbath and about the 'traditions of the elders' would be helpful. It is to such needs the gospel tradition owed its selection, preservation, or formulation.

One important conclusion has been drawn from this as to the purpose of the Gospels. They were not written as biographical sketches which aimed at presenting a 'life' of Jesus. The Evangelists were not primarily biographers or historians. They were missionary propagandists. They aimed at supplying the preachers and teachers of the Church with a clearly formulated statement of the Christian message. They are interested in the historical circumstances of the earthly life of Jesus mainly as examples and proofs of their message. If they had been biographers we would have had a description of the appearance of Jesus. But we have no hint of anything of the kind, whether He was tall or short, or whether He had any outstanding characteristics. It is almost impossible to write a 'life' of Jesus at all, because of the nature, the detached character, of the traditions. These are simply illustrative stories.

We can see from the speeches in Acts the form that the first preaching assumed. And from this, and from the nature of the Gospels themselves, we can see how these were written. The gospel story was formulated backwards. The main theme during these years before the existence of Q and Mark was the Resurrection. But this could not be preached without raising the question of the death of Jesus. And, because of the objections of the Jews, this assumed a very important place. We can see that from the space it occupies in the written Gospels. But inevitably the question would follow: Who was this Jesus whom God raised from the dead? And the answer to that question was found in the disconnected stories which we find in our Gospels of the acts and words of the Lord.

On the all-important matter of the authenticity of the gospel tradition the new criticism has a positive contribution to make. Where we can get back, as we often can, to the original oral tradition, we come upon something that is based on the living memory of the words and deeds of Jesus, as preserved by those who had known the Lord 'according to the flesh.' There was thus preserved a reliable outline of the story of His ministry, death, and resurrection, as well as a *corpus* of teaching as it came from the lips of Jesus Himself. Criticism is not without instruments by which it may, partially at least, disentangle the beliefs of a later age from the traditions of the earliest community of believers. And thus it can truly help us to recover genuine knowledge concerning the life and teaching of Jesus.

One thing more ought to be said. The really remarkable thing about the traditions preserved in the Gospels is their unity. That is to say, whatever their source, they give the same account of the impression Jesus made upon His contemporaries. Whether these traditions were collected in the

Church of the great imperial city of Rome (Mark), or in a cosmopolitan Greek-Syrian metropolis like Antioch (Q), or in a Palestinian seaport like Cæsarea (Luke), or in the Judæan churches of Palestine (Matthew), it is the same picture of Jesus that is presented. That is a very imposing evidence of the reliability of the picture of Jesus in our sources. And, though the new 'Form Criticism' does suggest a doubt of the trustworthiness of certain traditions at least in their present 'form,' it will be found on the whole and in the end to have made a positive contribution to our assurance.

Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr made a reputation for himself on this side of the Atlantic by his recent work, 'An Interpretation of Christian Ethics.' He will confirm and enhance that reputation by his latest work—*Beyond Tragedy* (Nisbet; 8s. 6d. net)—which, if it does not surpass the former in vigour of thought, surpasses it in attractiveness of style and presentation.

How shall we describe this new work? Perhaps the author's own description, though not readily understandable, is the best. The main subject, let us preface, is the Christian interpretation of history; and the particular aim is to lead the reader from the historical plane of time and sense to a hope and assurance which is 'beyond tragedy.' Here, indeed, in this last is the underlying unity of the (generally) disconnected chapters.

But let us listen to the author himself: 'The chapters of this book are sermonic essays elaborating one theme in various aspects. The theme is Christianity's dialectical conception of the relation of time and eternity, of God and the world, of nature and grace. It is the thesis of these pages that the Biblical view of life is dialectical because it affirms the meaning of history and of man's natural existence on the one hand and, on the other, insists that the centre, source, and fulfilment of history lie beyond history.'

The author's penetrative and attractive style is well illustrated in the first of these 'sermonic essays.' The text is 2 Co 6[4-10], and the reader is asked to concentrate his attention on the phrase in v.[8], 'as deceivers, and yet true'—a particularly intriguing paradox, which every apologist of the Christian faith might well make his own.

Why must the apologist of the Christian faith be a 'deceiver'? Because of the Christian view of God and the world. According to this view, the relation of time and eternity is dialectical. The eternal is revealed and expressed in the temporal but is not exhausted in it. The relationship between the eternal and the temporal cannot therefore be expressed in simple rational or logical terms, as in pantheism. It is a dialectical relationship, and can be expressed only in symbolic terms.

Niebuhr then proceeds to analyse the deceptive symbols which the Christian faith uses to express the dimension of eternity and time. Let us consider his analysis in reference to the doctrines of Creation, the Fall, and the Incarnation.

First, when we say that God created the world, we are deceivers yet true. Creation is a mystical idea which cannot be fully rationalized. For it relates the grounds of existence to existence, the eternal to the temporal. Since it is not a rational idea, it is a temptation to deceptions. Biblical liberalism succumbs to the temptation of insisting that belief in Creation involves belief in an actual creative activity of six days. Thus it corrupts ultimate religious insights into a bad science.

Again, when we say that man fell into evil, we are deceivers yet true. Here also we have a mythical idea which cannot be fully rationalized. For the Fall is not historical but trans-historical. The consciousness of sin and the consciousness of God are inextricably involved with each other. Since the Fall is not a rational idea, it is also a temptation to deceptions. Biblical liberalism succumbs to the temptation of insisting that belief in the Fall involves belief in the primitive myth of the garden, the apple, and the serpent.

Even a non-literalist Christian theology, which does not corrupt religious insights into a bad science, has been tempted to speak of a perfection before the Fall, as if that too were historical. The perfection before the Fall is an ideal possibility which men can comprehend but not realize. 'Even the sophisticated dialectical theology of Barth and his school speaks of the perfection before the Fall as historical, and consequently elaborates a doctrine of human sinfulness which approaches, and sometimes surpasses, the extremism of the historic doctrine of total depravity.'

Yet again, when we say that God became man to redeem the world from sin, we are deceivers yet true. The idea of eternity entering time is intellectually absurd. This absurdity is proved to the hilt by all the theological dogmas which seek to make it a rational idea. Reason cannot assert that the Creator in coming into Creation did not lose His unconditioned character. The truth that the Word was made flesh outrages all the canons by which truth is usually judged.

Yet it is the truth. The Creator reveals Himself not only in a general revelation, that is, in the sense that His creation is His revelation; but also in a special revelation. Christ is both the perfect man who restored the perfection of what man was and ought to be, and the Son of God who transcends all possibilities of human life. He is thus a true revelation of the total situation in which human life stands.

'There is every possibility of illusion and deception in this statement of the Christian faith. Men may be deceived by the primitive myth of the Virgin Birth and seek to comprehend as a pure historical fact what is significant precisely because it points beyond history. Or they may seek to explain the dogma of the Incarnation in terms which will make it an article in a philosophical creed. Such efforts will lead to varied deceptions; but the deceptions cannot destroy the truth of the Incarnation.'

The remark of Middleton Murry that 'it takes most men a lifetime to know what they really want, and the vast majority of human beings have not learned it on their death-beds' was never more obviously true than it is to-day. So many are like men on a journey who do not know their destination but follow the road blindly without inquiring where it leads to. In such circumstances it is no wonder if they are overcome at times with a sense of the futility of human effort and of human life. And so when things go wrong and the present moment seems unbearable they are tempted to escape from it all by the forbidden door.

In an interesting little book, entitled *What is the Purpose of Life?* (Rich & Cowan; 3s. 6d. net), the Rev. Lindsay Dewar, Principal of Bishops' College, Cheshunt, deals with this situation and the problems connected with it. The book is simple and in the main practical. It is not written for the philosopher but for the 'wayfaring man.' Its purpose, one may say, is to give first a rough sketch map of the country, and then to add directions as to the best route to follow.

Did it all happen by chance? Huxley suggested the possibility that a race of monkeys strumming on typewriters for an unlimited time would in the end hit upon all the books in the British Museum. 'Is such a supposition really credible, whatever the mathematical theory of chance may have to say. Personally I am inclined to think that there is a catch somewhere, and that the incredulousness with which the average man greets this contention of Huxley's is justified.' Besides, it has no relevance to the creation of the world. It begins by assuming a race of monkeys at work on typewriters, but that does nothing to explain the origin of them and of the whole universe. Still further, even if, by a chance hit, the order we see in the world were engendered, how are we to explain the fact that it has remained stable, and has not, as one would expect, by the next throw of chance been dissolved again into chaos?

The argument from design may have been unwisely stated, but the evidences in support of it are to the unsophisticated mind overwhelming. Paley's famous argument that a watch found on a heath required us to assume a maker to account for its mechanism has been scoffed at and may be antiquated in its form. But the fact is, 'Paley's mistake was not that he went too far in claiming the existence of design in the universe, but that he did not go far enough.' The complexity is infinitely greater than that of any mere clockwork. And if it be claimed that that wonderful, and apparently purposeful, complexity arises out of the cosmic process we have still to explain how the cosmic process came to possess such a strange potency. It may be taken, therefore, as for all practical purposes certain that the world we live in is the outcome of some great design, that we are not the playthings of chance, but, on the contrary, are intended to move towards some worthy goal.

It is not enough, however, to know that there is design in the world, giving evidence of fully conscious mind behind phenomena. That, doubtless, is much, but a still more important question remains: What sort of a mind? good or evil, kind or cruel, lovingly careful or completely indifferent? Here the whole problem of evil confronts us, and its seriousness is not to be minimized. Suggestions may be made that bring some relief. How great a proportion of the evil in the world is due to human sin! Undoubtedly much is blamed against God to-day which ought to be laid at man's door. God could not stop wars by force and stay the flood of human miseries without destroying man's free will and changing His own method of Fatherly rule to a despotic dictatorship. Still the problem remains, and perhaps the most that can be said from the purely naturalistic point of view is that 'the evil in the world is compatible with the goodness of God.' In any case, the problem is one that cannot be got rid of, for there is a problem of good as well as a problem of evil. It is, in fact, the strange mixture of good and evil in the world which constitutes the problem. If the question be asked, how is there so much evil in the world if there is a God of love, the opposite question may equally well be asked, how is there so much good in the world if there is *not* a God of love?

If we take it then that the world is governed by Intelligence and Love, that some great design of goodness is being wrought out through it, we are brought to the practical question of how we ought to live. To this question various answers are given. There is the obvious answer of the pleasure-seeker. But in practice it is found that to aim directly at pleasure is an attitude which defeats its own end. Moreover, it leads to disillusionment. 'Those whose objective is self-seeking, whether it be the gross self-seeking of the voluptuary or the more refined and philosophical self-seeking of the Epicurean, are sooner or later driven to the conclusion that life is barely worth living. This is the lesson of history, from the long-ago of Ecclesiastes to the present-day novelist, such as Mr. Aldous Huxley or Mr. Ernest Hemingway.'

There is the answer of the highbrow. Very truly did Solomon say, 'He that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow, and much study is a weariness to the flesh.' Or, as William James has put it, 'Too much questioning and too little responsibility lead, almost as often as sensualism does, to the edge of the slope, at the bottom of which lie pessimism and the nightmare or suicidal view of life.' This is abundantly exemplified in the highbrow pessimism of to-day. Hear it speaking in the eloquent hopelessness of Bertrand Russell: 'The life of man is a long march through the night, surrounded by invisible foes, tortured by weariness and pain, towards a goal that few can hope to reach, and where none may tarry long. . . . Brief and powerless is man's life; on him and all his race the slow, sure doom falls pitiless and dark.' This attitude has had a wide influence in our time, far beyond genuinely intellectual circles, and has given rise to what might be called 'a pseudo-highbrow attitude to life.' The average man, though intellectually lazy himself, is inclined to pay special heed to the utterances of the pundits. He is 'apt to receive the utterances of men like Mr. H. G. Wells or Mr. Bernard Shaw with something like the veneration and respect which a Christian pays to the Bible. The result is that a very large number of people adopt a kind of pseudo-highbrow attitude to life.' They are proud to call themselves agnostic, to feel that the problems of life are too complex for solution. It makes indecision intellectually respectable, and provides a grand excuse for moral indolence.

The right answer to the question of how we ought to live can only be given by one who is a true optimist, that is, one whose optimism is grounded in his belief in a God of love. The merely dutiful person, whose supreme guide in life is conscience, may go far astray, for he makes the fatal mistake of forgetting that conscience requires not only to be obeyed, but also to be educated and enlightened. ‘One of the most striking facts we encounter is that some of the worst deeds in history have been done by men and women with a clear conscience. . . . It is this capacity for self-deception which makes the merely dutiful attitude to life hopelessly unsatisfactory in practice.’ Our sense of right and wrong needs to be enlightened and informed by the love of God as revealed in Christ. ‘The true optimist finds in a God of love the supreme answer to the problem of life. Love, he maintains, is the only power which can give life its true worth. If we set out upon life's journey determined to follow Love, we shall find the true meaning of life; but we can only do this if we are fortified first by the conviction that Love reigns upon the throne of the universe, in other words, if we are persuaded that God is love.’

The conclusion, then, would seem to be that as the world expresses the purpose of a Mind infinite in Wisdom and Goodness, life becomes worth living in the highest sense to those who seek to enter into, and to co-operate with, that Loving Mind. And the answer to the individual question which each of us must face, as to what should be the purpose of *my* life, may be expressed by saying, ‘I must seek a mode of life which will enable me increasingly to appreciate the living and the loving God. This is only another way of saying that I must make worship the aim and centre of my life. For true worship is precisely the appreciation of the Creator by the creature. In the words of the Shorter Catechism, “The chief end of man is to glorify God and to enjoy Him for ever.”’ How this works out in practice, wherein it differs from the utilitarian view of life, what true worship is and how the perils of idolatry are to be avoided, and finally, what influence it should have upon the life of the body—for all this we must refer the reader to Principal Lindsay DEWAR's admirable little book.

The Rev. P. GARDNER-SMITH, B.D., Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, has issued a volume entitled *The Christ of the Gospels* (Heffer; 8s. 6d. net), in which he offers us a study of the gospel records in the light of critical research. The book is for the most part a running commentary on the narrative of the Four Gospels, with some selection of material intended to throw the chief events into relief. The narrative of St. Mark is treated as the basic narrative.

The spirit of the author's approach to his subject may be gathered from the words that follow: ‘The Gospels have been holy books for many generations, and they are holy books to-day. If, therefore, the modern student is led to question many old opinions, he will deal gently with convictions which he must respect, though he cannot share them. Not all wisdom is granted to one generation, and it is often possible that the latest views will prove on further examination to be mistaken. But reverence and respect for truth are not opposed; the highest reverence finds expression in the most transparent honesty, and no cause, least of all that of religion, is served by those who will not learn because they do not want to, and who prefer tradition to truth.’

As a sample of the author's treatment of his subject, let us take his chapter on ‘The Last Supper’ and present it in summary form. It is well known that many problems arise when we read the records of this event critically.

For instance, it is an old question whether the Last Supper is to be regarded as the Passover or not. The Synoptists quite clearly represent it as such, but the Fourth Gospel expressly contradicts this view: it was the preparation of the Passover when Pilate brought Jesus out to the people (Jn 19[14]). It is possible that the author of the Fourth Gospel was influenced by a desire to represent Jesus as the true Paschal Lamb, slain upon the Cross just at the time when the lambs of the old Passover were being killed; but on the whole it is more probable that the Last Supper took place, as St. John records, on the day before the Passover.

Another point: St. Paul, it is clear, thought that the custom of the Church in celebrating the Eucharist was in obedience to the direct command of Jesus: 'This do in remembrance of me' (1 Co 11[24]). But why did St. Mark, who wrote at least ten or fifteen years later than St. Paul, omit the command? It is perhaps most likely that St. Paul here adopts a local tradition which did not become world-wide until after the composition of the Second Gospel. Indeed, as our author avers, it did not win general acceptance until a time later than the composition of all the Synoptic Gospels, for it is absent from St. Matthew and from the true text of St. Luke. As to the question where St. Paul derived his tradition nothing can be said.

If the early Christian Eucharist did not depend on the express command of Jesus what then of its origin? Probably Jesus and His disciples were accustomed to join in the sacred meal (Kiddush) which was, and still is, a feature of Jewish life. If so, the Last Supper may have been only the last occasion on which they joined in it. That the Christian Eucharist was not exclusively connected with the Last Supper is suggested by the fact that St. John, who gives much eucharistic teaching, does not record the institution of the Eucharist in the Upper Room.

In St. Luke's account of the Last Supper a serious textual problem is involved. If the reading of certain important MSS. be right, not only is there no command to repeat the ceremony, but the cup is mentioned first, and is not described as 'my blood.' It may be that in celebrating the Eucharist in memory of the Lord, the first disciples not only carried on a custom which had belonged to Christ's earthly ministry as a whole, but were by no means consistent in the matter of the character and the order of the elements of the common meal. The memory of the Last Supper, where, as in the Jewish Kiddush, the blessing of a cup comes first, would suggest that the cup should come before the bread; but the fact that the Eucharist had always been celebrated with bread, but not always with wine, would cause the cup to be added at the end.

But it must be observed that Mr. Gardner-Smith makes two assumptions in this last statement which are questionable. The first is that the Lucan narrative, in which the cup is mentioned first, represents a more authentic tradition than the (earlier) Pauline narrative; and the second is that the eucharistic reference is present in the account of the meal at Emmaus (Lk 24[30]), and even in the account of the meal by the lakeside (Jn 21[13]).

If there is so little certainty as to the origin and significance of the earliest Christian Eucharist, it is no doubt disturbing to Christian devotion. But Mr. Gardner-Smith adds that Jesus would have approved of His Church continuing to do what He had so often done Himself; and that the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, if not a fact of history, is at any rate a fact of experience.

Symbolism in Worship.

By the Reverend R. C. Ford, M.A., B.D., Huddersfield.

The purpose of this paper is not to give a historical account of the various symbols associated with the practice of religion, though it will be impossible to avoid reference to them. It is rather to examine why symbols are used, what they are intended to express, to consider the most important religious symbols and the abuses to which they are liable, and finally, the way to make them more appropriate and helpful.

Joseph Parker used to say that we all carry our cradles with us. He there uses a symbol which needs no interpretation. The present writer was enrolled as a student at Edinburgh University in early manhood, and received his first impressions of philosophy from Campbell Fraser. He was cradled in the Berkeleian system, with the result that for him the material world was dissolved into nothingness, so that only personal spirits remained. But it was not always easy to be a philosopher, especially at times when the material world seemed painfully obvious, as described in the limerick:

There was a faith-healer of Deal,
Who said, Although pain isn't real,
When I sit on a pin,
And it punctures my skin,
I dislike what I think that I feel.

How was that sensation, and indeed all sensation to be explained? Bishop Berkeley said that God was speaking to us, and that our various sense impressions were the alphabet of His speech. Perhaps this small amount of autobiographical material may be excused as explaining the particular cradle the writer carries with him, and the standpoint from which he starts in this investigation.

The reality behind appearances is a Person who, touching our senses, causes us to perceive certain things. In our mutual intercourse we think we see and hear each other, but we are mistaken, for we are all hiding behind impenetrable barriers, across which we send signals. We are sure of the other person because we have learned to interpret the signals, not because we are immediately in contact. The method by which we communicate with each other is the same as that by which the Ultimate Spirit communicates with us. Since we are invisible and recognize others by the signals they make, it ought not to surprise us that the Supreme Spirit is also invisible. We recognize Him in the signs He makes.

The primary question in all philosophy is, Why was there ever anything? On the face of it there ought to have been nothing. We are conscious that there is some reality outside ourselves which is making impressions upon us. If it be that the Ultimate Person is signalling to us, He requires a medium through which His signals may be transmitted, an intermediate sphere where God and man can meet. And when such meeting takes place opposition or agreement must both be possible. If opposition were impossible we could have no independent existence, nor could we be held responsible for our reaction to the message of God. It is through that intermediate sphere that God indicates His purposes, and we our assent or hostility.

It is in this intermediate sphere that symbols are found to operate. There are many descriptions or definitions of a symbol. Dr. Inge says that they are the flesh and bones of ideas. In the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* we are told that 'a symbol is a visible or audible sign of some thought, emotion, or experience, interpreting what can be really grasped only by the mind and imagination by something which enters into the field of experience.' Professor H. H. Farmer says: 'By a symbol we mean a sign which indicates meaning, and the peculiar quality of a symbol is that it can only enter formatively into the mind of another, and affect his activity, if he can in some measure apprehend its meaning and accept it for himself.' He stresses the fact that genuine co-operation can only be reached when God elicits from man a spontaneous surrender, based on a perception of the essential rightness of God's demand. Meaning might be imposed without the use of symbol if the possibility of dissent were obliterated. An appeal which is not an authoritative edict must make use of symbol.

It is supposed that creatures below the level of personality do not require symbols, and that ants and bees communicate meanings directly, as though there were no frontiers separating one insect from the rest. The boundaries of each individual life seem to be porous, so that conceptions can saturate the whole hive or nest. It is as though the hive were the unit and the insects constituent elements. Though the atomic conception of individuality may need to be modified it is nevertheless true that man can close the frontiers of his mind against unwelcome aliens. Whatever seeks entrance must commend itself, when it is the responsibility of the individual to lower the barriers. Symbolism is the use of signals to convey ideas across the barriers.

There is considerable dispute concerning the origin and meaning of conscience, but it is quite possible that it is an 'authoritative edict' communicating to us directly the will of God. Even if that be so there is a parallel use of the symbolism. Without some intervening medium, revelation of the Divine might inflict injury instead of conferring blessing. On a certain occasion we are told that the Israelites around Sinai shrank with fear when Jahweh's voice was heard in the thunder. So fearful were they that they besought Moses to receive the message and pass it on to them. They dreaded the thought of direct contact. R. H. Hutton says that 'a powerful and massive character, though it be nearly perfect, often positively injures those within the circle of its influence. They lose the spring of their mind beneath the overwhelming weight of its constant pressure.' Much more is this the case with the Divine Personality. God hides Himself from us, not from unwillingness to communicate with us, but out of consideration lest our personality should suffer. Some medium must be interposed, just as we can only observe the sun through darkened glasses. The symbol is the darkened glass which permits our ordinary powers to function. Thus it both conceals and reveals—conceals what human nature could not bear, reveals what is in its compass to comprehend.

According to Dr. Inge our consciousness of the Beyond is the raw material of all religion; but being itself formless it cannot be brought directly into relation with the forms of our thought, and has to incorporate itself in symbols. Nature is the great symbol in which God expresses His thoughts. But Nature is too vast for our feeble comprehension. The intellect can only deal with its manifestations sectionally; and the total complex is more than the sum of the sections. There are gaps which no science can fill, and even if it could, the whole is placed in the midst of an unexplored ocean of being. The movement of billiard-balls on the level of the table may be accounted for by mechanical science, each movement being explained by a proximate cause. Behind all is the uncaused cause, the personality of the player, of which mechanics knows nothing. Religion is concerned with the Divine Originator who lies outside the sphere of science.

Logical speech is confronted with an impossible task when it attempts to explain the reality lying behind the apparent world.

> Words are weak and far to seek
>   When wanted fifty-fold;
> And so if silence do not speak,
> And trembling lip and tearful cheek,
>   There's nothing told.

Science may deal with the grammar of Nature, but not with that represented by the 'trembling lip and tearful cheek.' It may explain the words of the song, but cannot set forth what is expressed in the melody. Science can explain the phenomena of Sinai in terms of a thunder-storm. Religion knows that the sights and sounds denote much more than can be expressed in a scientific formula. 'Where one heard thunder, one saw flame, I only know He named my name.' Religion is concerned with the inexpressible kinds of reality.

Human culture at an early stage invented an alphabet, a series of pictures symbolizing facts of common experience. Much more then is it natural to suppose that symbolism will prove needful when dealing with the deeper experiences of religion. If thunder becomes a symbol of the voice of God, so sacrifice becomes the speech of man to God. The prophets are unable to think of God without the aid of symbols, and certainly need them when speaking of the Divine realities. Nor does that need diminish with the advance of civilization. The sacred writings of the New Testament are as full of symbol as are those of the Old. It seems necessary that the worshipper pass through temporal gateways before he can apprehend the spiritual world. The spoken word, sublime architecture, solemn music, and sacraments, all have their part to play.

Consider the stories of the temptation of Adam or of Jesus, of the call of Isaiah or of Jeremiah, of the transfiguration of Jesus or of the presence of the angel in Gethsemane. We are not being told bare facts, but facts full of significance, charged with deep inner meanings of which they are but the husk. One might find abundant material in the Fourth Gospel alone for a whole treatise on the writer's use of symbolism. The commonest event is for him the vehicle of some deeper truth. Apart from the spoken parables, the miracles, which he calls 'signs,' are acted parables. Sometimes the key to their meaning is appended, as when Jesus says, 'I am the bread of life, 'I am the light of the world,' 'I am the good shepherd.' The selection of incidents to be recorded of the experiences of Jesus are such as will enable us to discern the Deity incarnate in the human life. Abelard says that though the Ascension of Christ was a real fact, we are not to suppose that the body of Christ now occupies a local position. The material ascension was a picture-lesson of the better ascension in the souls of Christians. This, and not a flight through the air to some unknown goal, is the inner truth.

When we consider the surrounding world we discover two aspects of it in closest combination. There is Nature the non-personal, and Society the personal. We may think them apart but only experience them in association. Standing beneath the starry firmament we realize the awful majesty exhibited in Nature, and have some experience of the Ultimate Person. When we form part of a great company there is something warmer and more intimate in our experience, but that great company is set in a background of Nature. The two are always intermingled. When God signals through the overarching sky, or the forest glades, we are filled with a sense of awe, and are oppressed by the overpowering Spirit. When the signal comes through the person of another, or a company of others, we are conscious rather of the intimacy and friendliness of the Divine. Thoreau in the woods was 'made aware of the presence of something kindred to me'; but however much he felt the sympathy, there was in his experience an element lacking, which John Wesley knew when in the company of worshippers his heart 'was strangely warmed.' In both cases, contact with the Divine Spirit is realized through some medium serving as symbol.

Symbolic ceremonial has played an immense part in the religious life of the race. Sacrifice is said to have had a magical origin, but at least it is evidence that the sense of awe and dependence expressed itself in giving something or doing something, even though the worshipper might be unable to explain the impulse that moved him. When he attempted an explanation the reasons he assigned may have been very inadequate, there being a deeper reason for which he could give no explanation. Such practices when once established tended to perpetuity, and though their origin might be forgotten they became for later generations a protecting husk of the deeper spiritual truths through ages in which their meaning was only dimly discerned. They were pictures of spiritual blessings at a time when the blessings themselves could not be appreciated, and served to bring them to that state of mind which could appreciate the better thing prepared for them.

The Christian religion has two great symbols—Baptism and the Holy Supper. The Early Church called them symbols, implying that in them a mystery was concealed. Spiritual facts demand material expression, and the Sacrament is the appointed means for expressing a state of the soul. It is remarkable that Jesus, seeking to establish a spiritual religion, should have enjoined or countenanced such acts as these. Reducing ceremonial to a minimum He still found some symbol essential for the realization of His purposes for mankind. He wore upon His garment tassels of violet cord as a reminder of God's commandments and His own holy vocation. Here was clear sanction to an ancient custom which might be made the vehicle of religious truth. Buchanan Gray says that the motive for wearing these was a 'religious afterthought,' an attempt to make a deeply rooted custom serve a fitting religious purpose (*Numbers*, 183). Further, He attended the services in temple and synagogue in which elaborate use was made of forms and ceremonies as vehicles of Divine truth. And He so impressed the disciples that from the day of His crucifixion to the present they have partaken of an imitation meal because of its Divine significance, while those who have joined the fellowship have done so in the rite of baptism.

There are great Christian experiences which gain by outward expression, especially that moment when the soul welcomes the Christian hope, and those recurring periods when it acknowledges the constant nourishment and inspiration in communion with its Divine Lord. Outward acts aid the imagination, gather about themselves associations which create a congenial atmosphere for the spiritual life, and help to deliver the soul from pure subjectivity. But the most obvious and valuable aid is the linking of the will with the roused emotion. Whatever justification there may be for a form of baptism making less material demand than does immersion, it will be generally agreed that immersion is the mode set forth in the New Testament. Knowing this ceremony, both as subject and as administrant, the writer can testify that in it an inward state finds expression and satisfaction. This is frequently indicated by a certain radiance of countenance which can be likened to nothing so much as that seen on the face of the Lord at a corresponding moment in His experience. It means that a new position has been taken up involving the whole being. It is not that the outward act effects the inward change, but the inward change seeks outward expression. The essential change is the spiritual one, and yet there is distinct gain in the outward act. This is not surprising, for we lightly esteem a love which fails to reveal itself in outward and material form. 'If ye love me, keep my commandments,' said Jesus. 'Let us not love in word, neither with the tongue; but in deed and truth,' says the First Epistle of John. One seriously doubts the love which never utters itself in gifts. 'God *so* loved that he gave.' Von Hügel says: 'I kiss my child, not only because I love it; but I kiss it also in order to love it.' Regimental colours may be accurately described as a rag at the end of a pole, but he is unlikely to be a good soldier who sees in them nothing more. The material symbol incarnates in itself imperishable values and gathers into a focus vague and wandering emotions.

There is a type of religion which distrusts symbolism and seeks to abolish it. Titus, penetrating the Holy of Holies, exclaimed in surprise, 'There is nothing.' But that empty chamber was itself a symbol whatever the conscious intention of it, and it indicated the Jewish conviction of the transcendent majesty of God. There is something of the same sternness in Calvinistic worship. Had it been possible, all forms would have been abolished as unnecessary creaturely aids. There was a bleak lucidity in the thinking of these devout souls, which scorned the use of stepping-stones to cross the void between the temporal and the Eternal. No organ, no choir, no colour were permitted to distract the intent soul. When in more recent days organs were gradually introduced, intense feeling was roused which expressed itself in riots. Nevertheless, psalms were sung, since they were scripture, and the tables of the Commandments were painted on the walls.

The same type of mind is found amongst the Quakers, who are more thoroughgoing than any branch of the Church Universal in rejecting all symbols. In a building destitute of ornament there is a service without arrangement. The purpose is to leave the soul in adoring silence in the presence of the Eternal and Holy, without any intervening medium. Robert Barclay testifies: 'When I came into the silent assembly of God's people I felt a secret power amongst them which touched my heart, and as I gave way unto it I found the evil weakening in me and the good raised up.' The demand here is for absolute sincerity, laying bare the soul before God, a fear of all sorts of formalism and a positive dread of institutional religion. The religious consciousness seems to have gone full circle, holding hands with the hermits and mystics who fled from the elaborate apparatus of worship, to seek God in the silence of the desert.

The aim in most of the Free Churches is to be simple, direct, free from ordered forms. The priesthood of all believers is emphasized, and the separate responsibility of each soul. It has been said that the *Pilgrim's Progress* is the Divine Comedy of Free Church Christianity, and that is concerned solely with the experience of the individual believer. In its assemblies for worship, edification is sought, and what is mysterious is lightly esteemed. There is constant fear lest liturgical acts should absorb attention which ought to be directed to personal communion and the absolute demand of God upon the soul. Even in such an environment need is felt for some symbols; and during the last quarter of a century changes have taken place. Buildings and services are made more beautiful; mosaic floors, marble pulpits, stained-glass windows, flowers on the holy table have evidenced a subtle change. Some fearful souls see in these innovations a leaning towards those beggarly elements which our fathers discarded at the Reformation. Can we judge between symbolism that is desirable, and symbolism that is a snare?

It was not for nothing that our fathers erected bleak and gaunt buildings. They dreaded lest outward forms should distract the mind from the contemplation of God, and should absorb an attention which ought to be fixed on God alone, thus luring the soul into the ancient sin of idolatry. They banished images from churches, and pictures from the walls; but they transferred the pictures to the windows, and expended upon them a wealth of art which would have been denounced had it expressed itself in images. It is strange that art in two dimensions should be deemed helpful, but in three dimensions hurtful. Forsyth thinks that all art is a peril to religion, since it is often careless about the moral foundations of life, and is able to cast a glamour about evil and make sin doubly engaging.

Let us then note that mere prettiness and decoration have no symbolic value. A symbol to be true and helpful must reveal in itself a law at work in the wider realm of God's activity. When our Lord used the Vine as a symbol of the relation between Himself and the disciples, He was comparing God's operation in two realms—the material and the spiritual. When the convert is immersed in water in the name of the Trinity, and rises again from it, he is saying in material language that he has undergone a complete spiritual change. When we partake of bread and wine we are expressing in appropriate actions the spiritual dependence of the believer on the constant supplies furnished by God for the sustenance of the new life. But when Romano Guardini says that the worshipper must strike his breast and not merely touch his garments, because it is a prescribed action it lacks the reality manifest when the publican involuntarily smote his breast in an agony of contrition. Guardini knows the peril, for he says, 'It is true that in all such symbolism there is danger of mere childish play-acting. The sweet-smelling clouds (of incense) may bring on a kind of haze in the imagination, a kind of mystical play-acting. If this occurs, then the Christian conscience rightly protests, and calls us back to prayer "in spirit and in truth." It warns us to be both simple and upright.' When a Christian wishes to come into the presence of the Holy God, he instinctively bows his knees, closes his eyes, and clasps his hands. These are natural symbols which one uses without thinking about the form, differing widely from a devotion so occupied with postures and correct procedure, that the attention remains on the material level, thinking its end accomplished when the correct words and actions have been used. It is no longer spontaneous but arbitrary, so that meanings have to be imposed upon the forms; whereas in a true symbol the soul finds the relief of a natural expression. Attention absorbed in trivialities forgets the weightier matters of the Law. In the second stage of the Oxford Movement discussion became quite acrimonious concerning minute details to the neglect of the great truths supposed to be expressed in the disputed observances. If one who has been nurtured in a ceremonial religion feels the snare, much more is the Protestant likely to find in some of these signs stumbling-blocks rather than aids.

Doubt has been expressed as to whether Baptism and the Supper were 'prescribed' by our Lord as perpetual ordinances. There was at least the sanction of Divine example for their adoption, and the universality of their observance would then testify more forcibly to a universal need and a universal satisfaction. In both the sense of oneness with the Lord is very vivid. In Baptism the disciple enters sympathetically into the redeeming acts of Christ, the death, burial, and resurrection. The outward actions do truly express inward states. It is the essence of these symbols that they shall really picture in material forms changes taking place in the inner life. As Professor Wheeler Robinson puts it, you may emphasize the importance of Baptism as much as you like provided that it is the Baptism of the Believer. So in the Holy Supper the events of that last night are recalled and imitated as closely as possible. In some churches the memorial aspect is most evident, in others the spiritual sustenance, or the communion, with all the faithful and with the Lord. The best observance combines them all. The whole is a majestic symbol in which the material objects—the table, the bread and wine—become types of the heavenly feast, and the food and drink are not physical but spiritual.

Many symbols may be considered as kindergarten apparatus wherein truth is adapted to minds unfamiliar with abtruse intellectual processes. Von Hügel admits that there is truth in the contention of some philosophers that 'the Church is essentially a condescension to the multitude, a largely childish symbol and kindergarten for what philosophy alone holds and teaches with virile adequacy.' He nevertheless maintains that religious life would be richer if the use of symbolism were more considered. The purpose of this paper is to commend such consideration. One section of the Church Universal may have unduly elaborated symbol, whereas other sections have reacted by suspicion of all symbols. Dr. C. J. Cadoux, in his book on *Catholicism and Christianity*, pays full tribute to Rome for the many excellences to be found in its organization and practices. He specifies in particular the 'peculiar ability to apprehend the objects of worship with vivid concreteness, and, mentally at least, to clothe them with reality and objectivity.' He speaks also appreciatively of 'the whole Catholic sense of the Divine in human life, and in particular to the sense of the reality of Christ.' These are advantages not to be lightly valued. It ought to be possible to secure for Protestant worship something of the same quality, without sacrificing a rigid sense of truthfulness which is equally to be desired.

We may therefore rejoice in an increased interest in the employment of symbolism in worship. Duncan-Jones, writing on *The Necessity of Art*, reminds us that 'when other parts of religion lose their appeal, when men find it difficult to place faith in the sacred writings, or to accept the formulas or creeds, yet this action will retain its attraction, and seem filled with a reasonable, serene, and lofty mystery. . . . The dumb instinctive ceremonial of the Cenotaph is a warning that something stirs in the human heart which we have by our conventions too long made men forget.'

In all this we have not ventured to discuss the greatest symbol of all. God is a Spirit whom no man has seen or can see; yet has He spoken to us in One who is 'the very image of his substance,' the Mediator between God and man; and to this day when we desire to establish contact with the Most High, we scarce need to press behind the symbol, so adequately does He express to us the majestic and tender qualities of the Eternal.

War, Pacifism, and Peace.

By the Reverend Professor R. Corkey, M.A., D.Phil., M.P., The Presbyterian College, Belfast.

The word 'realism' has fallen in the mud of late and become somewhat defiled. As frequently used in international parlance, a 'realist' is a man whose conscience will permit him to plunder his neighbour shamelessly, so long as he can get away with it. That type of realism we would all like to repudiate. We cannot afford, however, as servants of God in a real world, to be other than realists, in the sense of being willing to face all the facts as they confront us in God's creation. In the spirit of realism of this sort, I would like at the outset to call attention to some elementary facts that are relevant to the question before us.

The first of these facts is that we come into the world endowed with a combative spirit. We are all prone on occasions to fight. 'There's a lot of solid kicking in the meekest looking mule'; and most of us might confess to occasional stirrings of sympathy with the posterior proclivities of that homely quadruped. Were it not for the restraints, spiritual and social, that are imposed upon us, many of us would be quite intolerable people to live with.

The second fact is that human nature is peculiarly prone to fight for its rights, or what it regards as such. This is as true of nations as of individuals. The root cause of war, for the most part, is not to be found in economic, religious, or cultural disagreements merely, but in patriotic passion bred in sovereign powers by a *sense of injustice*, in conditions which afford to these powers no hope of securing justice save by war.

A third fact is that this fighting tendency, when not subject to social control, has been an almost unmitigated nuisance in the whole history of mankind. It is tended to embroil and inflame individual, family, and national relations wherever it has found vent.

The fourth fact is that ordered societies everywhere have discovered how to deal with this disruptive element. Communities have everywhere dealt with it in the same way. *First*, they have absolutely forbidden aggrieved persons, unless in exceptional circumstances, to take the law into their own hands. *Second*, they have established courts of justice to adjudicate between a man and his fellow when strife arose. *Finally*, and this is important, they have put the whole organized force of the community at the disposal of their courts, to ensure that the verdicts of the courts would be respected and that disputants would acquiesce in these verdicts whether in all respects they liked them or not. Almost three hundred years ago Pascal wrote these wise words, 'Force without justice is tyranny and stands convicted of itself; justice without force is a myth, because there are always the bad men. We must therefore put together justice and force and so dispose things that whatever is just is mighty, and whatever is mighty is just.'

In the quest for international peace we have to deal with the very same combative human nature as has, in every separate community, called for the rule of law. There is every reason, therefore, to suppose that the methods by which peace can be secured in the international world will not differ in any essential respect from the methods which have been everywhere successful in the more limited communities of national life. 'The League,' as General Smuts said in his recent New Year's message, 'simply carries a step farther the process by which the State has already succeeded in suppressing private feuds and public violence.'

Let me quote a notable and well-informed authority on this point, Sir John Seely, whose opinion may have the more weight in that it was expressed over seventy years ago. 'There has been found hitherto but one substitute for war. It has succeeded over and over again. It succeeds regularly in the long run wherever it can be introduced. This is to take the disputed question out of the hands of the disputants, to refer it to a third party whose intelligence, impartiality, and diligence have been secured, and to impose his decision upon the parties with overwhelming force. The last step in the process, the power of enforcing the decisions by the federal union only, is just as essential as the early ones, and if you omit it, you may just as well omit them too.' I confess that when I came across this statement I almost hailed it with a cheer.

These are the principles which were burned into the minds of all great statesmen during the years of the Great War, and to which they endeavoured to give expression in the Covenant of the League of Nations.

In my opinion it is one of the supreme tragedies of the moment that the Christian Church is sharply divided on the question of the morality of one of the fundamental principles of the League. While every one wants peace, there is in every denomination a passionate minority who believe that the use of sanctions in international affairs is contrary to the teaching of the spirit of Christ. This is the view which I am chiefly concerned to examine in the following paragraphs of this paper. Before, however, considering this pacifist conception of Christian love, it is desirable that I should refer briefly to a second and more empirical line of argument on which these pacifists rely. They argue that the policy of sanctions has been tried and found wanting. The plight of China and Abyssinia cries out against any further attempt to end wars by military measures.

What are we to think about this opinion? In spite of these initial failures of the League to maintain peace, I believe that an examination of the facts ought to convince any one that it is premature to conclude that the principles upon which the League had been founded are mistaken and ought to be abandoned.

First, it may be pointed out that the numerous successes which the League has had in settling disputes between small nations has been due in no small measure to a consciousness amongst these small nations that, so far as their affairs were concerned, the League did actually possess considerable power. Cases in point could easily be cited.

Second, so far as the actual League failures themselves are concerned, there were many extenuating facts, only a few of which can be mentioned in the briefest terms. The League is as yet very immature; it is imperfect in its structure, as 'The New Commonwealth Association' have pointed out; it is as yet very inadequately understood by multitudes of people in every country, including our own; it is liable, as a consequence, to lack for a time that popular and Government support which alone will render it efficient. Our own system of British justice was not made perfect in a day. We have no grounds for supposing that a system of justice for the world ought to operate without a hitch in eighteen years.

I must, however, turn now to the more formidable objection that is made to the League of Nations as at present constituted, namely, that its policy of sanctions is contrary to the principles of Christian morals. Those who hold this view quote such texts from the New Testament as, 'Resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.' 'Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven.'

In considering this position I would point out, first of all, that no one whatever accepts the letter of these commands as applicable without exception to every situation in life. In interpreting such words as these, we do not make void the command by distinguishing between 'the spirit' and 'the letter.' Christian love obviously permits, and indeed demands at times, some resistance to evil. No one could really object to the action of the policeman who forcibly shows the drunken brawler his way home. Professor G. H. C. Macgregor explicitly makes this concession in his book, *The New Testament Basis of Pacifism*. He says: 'Just as God's universe has laws which react against the evil-doer, so must our society have laws which similarly react and similarly demand penalties. Otherwise no moral order of society could exist.'

The question for the Christian moralist turns then, not on the legitimacy of force as such, but on the legitimacy of the type of force regarded as necessary for the establishment of an international order, namely, military measures or war. This is the point at which the issue is really joined between those who believe heartily in the League of Nations policy, and those who, like the late Rev. Dick Sheppard, Professor Raven, and Professor Macgregor, believe that in the international sphere only non-violent resistance is permissible.

In view of the impressiveness of the general principle, so succinctly stated by Sir John Seely, that wherever stable peace has been established it has been by means of the authority of law strong enough to compel respect, we are justified in subjecting to careful examination the arguments of those who would have us believe that it is contrary to Christian morals to use the same means for the achievement of a stable peace in the international world. These arguments I find to be very dubious.

In the first place, these writers themselves, at the points in the argument when they are compelled to scrutinize closely the hateful facts that breed war, are not able to adhere consistently to their own beliefs. Professor Raven, for example, in his book, *Is War Obsolete*, says: 'Many of us who would assert without hesitation that war between Christian and cultured men is as out of date as duelling, cannot so promptly denounce it when used against those to whom it seems the only effective instrument.' Later he is even more explicit. 'In dealing with those to whom force is the only restraint, are we not spiritually bound to use the effective means ?' These words are reminiscent of the doctrine of 'the big stick.' Professor Macgregor also, when he comes up against the ugly reality of 'the bad men,' in the international world, makes similar concessions. He writes: 'Not a few pacifists, the author included, would approve of an international police force, even of soldiers, if operating in a virtually disarmed world. The soldier would then be a policeman in fact and not merely in name.' I find it difficult to discover any difference in principle between the policy here approved of and that endorsed by the founders of the League.

These writers seem to have been betrayed into their precarious position by the purely imaginary notion they seem to have about a policeman. One would be led to suppose from their references that a policeman is essentially a ponderous, good-natured, slow-moving, soft-voiced individual with a brogue, who spends his time, with pencil and notebook, taking down the names of foolish people who violate traffic regulations, or dilute their buttermilk or sell dirty eggs. The truth is, however, that in every country in the world the police are compelled to have lethal weapons in reserve; and when they are called upon to deal with desperate law-breakers, such as gun-men shooting indiscriminately from fast cars, they throw aside pencils and notebooks and deal with the desperadoes in a sterner way.

Further, these writers in their denunciations of the policy of sanctions almost invariably slur over the vital distinction between 'war as a purely national policy' and 'war as police action in defence of the rule of law.' Mere denunciation of war in general, however valuable it might be for an audience of jingoistic militarists, never comes to grips with the real question involved in the morality of a policy of sanctions. Every Christian who takes his religion seriously loathes war. The problem for him, however, still remains—How is the rule of law in the international world to be protected in the last resort from 'the bad men'? To that question I can see only one answer.

Further, in defence of their position, pacifists are wont to put forward the plea that a good man is never really shut up to a choice of two evils. Professor Macgregor, for example, in the book to which I have referred, says explicitly: 'It is impossible to believe that God will ever face the holy consecrated Christian with a dilemma in which there is only a choice of two evils.' If this were true it would certainly relieve Christian people of the obligation of any complicity with the employment of sanctions; but the plea is entirely mistaken. It is contrary to the facts of everyday experience. Every surgeon, called upon to perform a painful and urgent operation, has laid upon him the ineluctable obligation of making choice between two evils. He can choose either to operate, or to allow his patient to die. There is no other alternative. As an honourable man he is morally bound in such a dilemma to choose the lesser evil.

Of course when, as occasionally happens, the alternatives presented are equally bad, or in themselves insignificant, a refusal to choose may be pardoned. But when one evil is immense as compared with the other, a good man's conscience will oblige him to choose the less. When it is a choice between forcibly stopping a bully bent on war, or abandoning the world to eternal anarchy, I can see no possibility of evading the choice of the first alternative.

Further, it seems to me even more seriously misleading to suggest, as these writers do, that this obligation to choose the lesser evil may be set aside on the ground that such a refusal to act in hard cases is just part of the cross we have to bear. 'There is always an exit from a choice of evils by the way of the Cross,' says the Rev. Leyton Richards. For the reasons already indicated, I entirely dissent from this opinion. In a hard case, it is just the *obligation to choose* that is a cross. The *refusal to choose*, however, in such a hard case is not really the acceptance of a cross but a dereliction of duty.

Another argument of a somewhat different character that is frequently used by pacifists calls for reference at this point. It is said that any attempt to use sanctions would involve the employment and approval eventually of every form of atrocity known to modern warfare. This, however, is an entirely gratuitous and very improbable hypothesis; and its plausibility is based on an irrelevant comparison. If, as is likely, sanctions will never be imposed by an international tribunal unless overwhelming force is available, it is very improbable that those responsible for the employment of that force will have resort to such practices as the bombing of open towns. One might as well object to the employment of force by the constabulary on the ground that, in some hypothetical situation, the use of such force might involve civil war. In addition, we ought to remember that in an anarchic world such methods of frightfulness will certainly continue to be used; and the choice that peace lovers have to make, it seems to me, is not a choice between force or no force, but between 'force for the rule of law,' or 'methods of frightfulness for merely national ends.'

Two other lines of argument must be mentioned, both of them at first sight very impressive. It is often suggested, on the analogy of the way of salvation revealed in a crucified Redeemer, that the way to the world's peace will be found in the voluntary sacrifice of some martyr nation. The theory is that when some peace-loving nation becomes sufficiently devoted to the cause of peace to discard all its armaments and accept in quietness of spirit any injustice that may be inflicted upon it, then the times of war will be at an end. The impressiveness of such a sacrifice will, it is claimed, transform the world.

Impressive as this analogy is, I can discover no grounds for believing that the hypothesis based upon it is warranted. It seems to me to be a wild surmise. One might as well assert that if a father could be found who was ready to allow his child to be kidnapped, the underworld would be so startled and impressed that all baby-snatching would cease. The restraining power of non-violent resistance is, in some circumstances, very real, and I have no wish to depreciate its value, but in an imperfect world it is no substitute for a framework of just and strong law. The ignoring of this fact is the fatal flaw in such books as Mrs. W. M. Swanwick's *Collective Insecurity*, and Mr. R. W. Gregg's *The Power of Non-violence*. Men will never believe, in any great numbers, that peace and security can be had merely by allowing justice to go by default in all circumstances. It is not true in national life; why should it be true in international life?

One other argument against the use of sanctions remains to be mentioned. It is the argument of those who say, 'Well, I cannot imagine Christ carrying a rifle or operating a bombing aeroplane, and that is enough for me.'

I need hardly say that I have the deepest sympathy with the sentiments of those who make this plea. In the light of all the facts, however, regarding the authority of Christ's example, I am bound to say that the plea is no more convincing than any of the others to which I have referred. Though the images that we have in the Gospels of the historic Christ present Him to us in a secure and tranquil environment where men and women could buy and sell, sow and reap, love, marry, raise up children, and be gathered to their fathers, acknowledging at all times that God is their sufficient aid, we are compelled occasionally to remind ourselves that these gospel pictures form but a selection of the infinitely varied tasks of life to which God calls men, and which may be carried through in the spirit of Christian love.

The application of this truth to the matter before us is obvious. In a sinful and imperfect world, ramparts against social disorder have still to be built and maintained, and, if we are to have world peace, these ramparts must be built in ever-increasing range and efficiency. And since the earth is the Lord's, and since all the conditions and responsibilities of an ordered moral society have been ordained by Him, it is plain to me that the harsh and elemental work of erecting and defending the dykes that protect our civilization can be undertaken in the spirit of the love of Christ by those who understand the facts.

May I sum up my chief conclusions. *First*, abiding peace cannot be secured by the use of force alone. *Second*, the use of force, in alliance with justice, can secure peace, and, when so allied, is not contrary to the will of God. *Third*, justice in the international sphere is that arrangement which affords to the people of any nation the fullest and best life possible, consistent with the possibility of an equally good life for all others. *Fourth*, human intelligence can seldom determine such justice with perfect exactness, but men generally are prepared to accept as justice, that determination of it which is arrived at by impartial judges. *Fifth*, in default of such impartial justice the multitude of men will fight if they think they have a chance of success, and when the issues at stake are important. *Sixth*, a League of Nations with impartial courts, and backed by goodwill and adequate force, is indispensable to world peace. The alternative is world anarchy, constant misunderstandings, claims, counter-claims, and war.

◆

Literature.

NEW TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION.

The critical study of the New Testament is pursued so diligently in our time that 'Introductions' by competent scholars succeed each other at short intervals; and the serious student of the New Testament welcomes this, and gladly places another such work on his shelves. Accordingly, we commend to his attention *An Introduction to the New Testament* (Christophers; 7s. 6d. net), by Kirsopp Lake, D.Litt., Ph.D., and Silva Lake, Ph.D. It is a work which covers the ground common to New Testament Introductions, but which has at the same time, as we might well expect, distinctive features and qualities of its own.

For example, after treating of the books of the New Testament individually it devotes considerable space to the subject of the Jewish and Greek Background, of which there has been so much recent investigation, and then goes on to supply useful appendices on the chronology and the topography of the New Testament. Another feature of the book is its well-balanced estimate, as appears in the valuable bibliography, of the respective contributions in the field of the New Testament of British, American, and Continental scholars.

The authors seek to give here the generally accepted results of modern study of the New Testament without attempting to deal with the theological, philosophical, or ecclesiastical problems which are inevitably related to it; and they seek to give the aforesaid results in a form such as the general reader may appreciate, at the same time being careful to indicate the more detailed treatments to which reference may be made. It is a quiet and sober form in which their book is couched, but this enables them to pack their pages full.

In defending their book against the charge of according meagre space to the treatment of the Gospel of John the authors plead the failure of any attempts at the analysis of this Gospel to reach the state of relative certainty which is found in the analysis of the Synoptic Gospels. They suggest that there is no direction in which the attention of younger scholars could be more fruitfully turned than that of the elucidation of the problems of the Gospel of John.

THE DEATH OF JESUS.

A worth-while book on the central Christian topic of the Death of Christ appears at rare intervals. One has just been issued—*The Death of Jesus*, by Emeritus-Professor A. B. Macaulay, D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net). Such books are rare, largely because a special combination of qualities is necessary in their writers, and few possess them. Among such *desiderata* are—familiarity with all the best written hitherto, discerning judgment, keen exegetical faculty with regard to New Testament passages, ripe personal religious experience and, above all, a profound reverence in face of the great theme handled. None is more gifted than Dr. Macaulay in such essentials. When we add that he can write in charmingly lucid style, we have said sufficient as to his qualifications for attempting such a task.

We have not yet adduced, however, what makes this book so worth-while. Let us hasten, then, to add that Dr. Macaulay breaks new ground. That he has said the last word on so great a subject, none would deny with such force as himself. That he has said the latest, most original, and most promising word, we are confident in affirming. Just because his treatment is so original there is every likelihood of criticism and modification. Time and reflection alone can tell. Meanwhile we cordially and enthusiastically commend this volume to the study of all Christian believers who love to be able to give some sort of reason for the faith which is in them.

In an introductory chapter Dr. Macaulay, pleading for restatement of the Christian faith in terms suitable to our age, has some hard things to say about Creeds and Confessions. These may sometimes irritate, but let the irritated pass on; the chapter is not essential to the main subject.

Dr. Macaulay's treatment of his real topic consists of four chapters upon three questions—(*a*) the will of man in relation to the death of Jesus; (*b*) the will of Jesus Himself in relation to His death; (*c*) the will of God in relation to the death of Jesus. In (*a*) we have adequate consideration in light of the most recent studies of the factors which conspired to send Jesus to the Cross—Pharisees, Sadducees, Pilate, etc. Some difference of opinion may arise as to the 'blasphemy.' Dr. Macaulay scarcely does justice to the recorded fact that it was no statement about the Temple that caused the High Priest to rend his garments, and brought the investigation against Jesus to an end. That apart, this examination of the events of Holy Week is brilliant and illuminating.

In (*b*) it is well brought out that the death of Jesus is quite unique in this respect, that unlike other 'martyrs' Jesus looked forward to His death as in some sense His most real work; it was, so far as He was concerned, a voluntary laying down of His life.

In (*c*) we have an exceedingly able and penetrating evaluation of the degree of propriety with which the terms 'ransom,' 'propitiation' and 'satisfaction' may be used. Each of them 'will probably appeal to every one of us at different times. But final validity cannot be claimed for all or any of them. They are ultimately but tentative.'

It is the sub-section of (*b*) dealing with the Ordeal of Jesus in His Death that is most original and will arouse most interest. What was the ordeal of the Cross for Jesus? What is the meaning of the cry of dereliction? Was the death necessary? These are great questions which all confess bring us face to face with mysteries. None can have greater awe before the mystery than Dr. Macaulay. One senses that here he feels himself almost afraid to speak. Yet he is sure of one thing, that we must stop speaking of Christ's experience on the Cross as penal. The Cross, he maintains, was not the climax of pains inflicted, it was the climax of temptation. 'He suffered being tempted' is taken —in its deeper of two possible and both true interpretations—to mean His sufferings were temptation—an agony of temptation—to renounce faith in either man's redeemability or His own Sonship.

To follow Dr. Macaulay here is not simple. Everything is not so clear as one might desire. The thought is so original that one needs time to do justice to it. Let our readers try. The effort will abundantly repay them.

One thing we miss which would add greatly to the value of the book—an index of Scripture passages.

THE NEW LIFE OF ST. PAUL.

The Home University Library has enriched the general reader by many works of great value. Among these one thinks at once of Dr. Edwyn Bevan's 'Christianity,' an important book. Of the latest addition to the series, *St. Paul*, by Arthur Darby Nock, Professor of the History of Religion in Harvard University, the best we can say is that it is worthy to stand beside Dr. Bevan's book (Butterworth; 2s. 6d. net). The necessary limitation of space has proved in one sense a blessing. It saves us from the tiresome habit many theologians have of telling us what their predecessors for hundreds of years have said on their subject. But it entails severe deprivations also. The author has no room to tell us why he rejects the South Galatian theory, why he rejects the Pauline authorship of Ephesians (the tendency of criticism is all the other way), why he refuses Dr. Duncan's contention that the Epistles of the Captivity were written at Ephesus, and what are the grounds of his analysis of 2 Corinthians. But this restriction of space makes the writer's achievement all the more striking. In some two hundred and fifty pages he surveys the life and thought and religion of the great Apostle, dealing with all the relevant problems even when these are little more than mentioned.

The big questions, however, receive adequate treatment. And these are mainly just two—the relation of Paul's teaching to that of Jesus and its relation to Hellenism. On the first, the author does not range himself with those who regard Paul as the real author of Christianity, as one who transformed the simple teaching of Jesus into a theology. 'We must never forget,' he writes, 'that in some of the weightiest matters Paul understood and developed ideas of Jesus which were obscured and imperilled at Jerusalem.' Paul's own religious thinking is expounded in pages which are a marvel of compression and clearness. On the other question, Paul's relation to Hellenism, Professor Nock is quite definite. 'The differences between Pauline and Hellenistic sacramentalism are essential and not superficial, and the concept, sometimes invoked, of a general Hellenistic sacramentalism as a substantial entity in the thought of the time is not warranted by existing evidence.'

Professor Nock's views are very definite, even when they are of a negative character; and the reader may sometimes be slightly irritated by the author's scepticisms. The speech at Athens is a brilliant piece of imaginative writing. In all probability there was no such thing at Athens as an altar dedicated 'To an Unknown God.' The moving speech at Miletus must be ascribed to the writer of the book and not to Paul. The scene depicted at Rome in which Paul discusses matters with Jewish visitors, if taken literally, is impossible; it stands here for dramatic effect. And, finally and most annoying of all, the evidence is entirely against Jesus having said the words of institution, 'this do . . .' or having thought of any repetition of the ordinance. One sometimes smiles at the assurance with which such statements are made, but they do not abate our appreciation of the book as a whole. Its balance, its insight, its sheer ability, its satisfying admiration of its subject, all this and much more goes to increase our gratitude for a study of St. Paul that makes a genuine contribution to our knowledge of the Apostle.

THE GOD WHOM WE IGNORE.

The God Whom We Ignore, by the Rev. John Kennedy, B.D., Ph.D. (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net), is a striking book, and should find a place in the library of every minister who is discouraged or who has become slightly institutionalized in relation to his congregation. Dr. Kennedy is concerned chiefly with the problem of the merely nominal church member who attends public worship infrequently. The fundamental reason for lack of interest in the Church is that men have lost their appetite for God. There are, no doubt, other reasons—social reasons, such as the excessive respectability of the average congregation which intensifies the inferiority complex of the unsuccessful and strengthens the exclusiveness of the prosperous. But the main difficulty is the 'projection' on to the Church of responsibility for personal religion, and the only solution of the Church's problems lies in the recovery of the appetite for God. Apart from this the social service in which so many Church members find refuge is a spiritual camouflage; 'the greatest blunder any man can make in Christian living is to seek to change his neighbour and to take himself for granted.' So the faithful minister must begin and continue with the effort to persuade people, old as well as young, *not* to take themselves for granted. Public worship is emptied of reality without personal spiritual discipline and must depend on the cultivation of private devotion, but at the same time it is richer than this. In our public worship we surrender ourselves to God in the midst of the surrender of our neighbours; we are representative of them, and, not only as ministers but as members, we come as priests of society into the presence of God.

Dr. Kennedy is fully alive to modern problems. The challenge of Communism, with its particular charge that the 'other-worldliness' of Christianity is simply a dope to keep the working classes moderately contented, is met by showing that it is because of its worldliness rather than its other-worldliness that the Church has failed. The difficulty caused by the alleged archaism of the Bible and of antiquated theology is relieved by a frank distinction between the setting of revelation and revelation itself, by the reminder that Christianity did not begin yesterday, and that every good man who has lived by it has expressed his spiritual convictions in the language of his own age, and by the encouraging thought that seeming sceptics have 'not discovered that God is indispensable but only that certain conceptions of God are not indispensable.'

The author is a little suspicious of modern Sunday-school organization and of the enthusiasm within congregations for Scouting and Guiding. The danger of grading of lessons is that many Sunday-school pupils retain only the ideas of Christianity which have been very specially adapted to their juvenile minds, and, thinking that this is the whole of Christianity, consider themselves justified, on reaching adolescence, in putting it away with other childish things. The danger of many youth organizations is that, because of insufficient emphasis upon the religious aspects, they become substitutes for the true service of the Church rather than a preparation for it. It would be altogether wrong, however, to think that because of criticisms of this kind the author is old-fashioned. The book is modern through and through, and full of original and progressive ideas for the improvement of our Church services both in form and substance. But the fundamental conception of the whole book is that 'it is not the changed times that are keeping the people away from the church, but their estranged hearts.' Dr. Kennedy desires with the utmost intensity to guide the souls of men back to the worship and awe of God, as He is revealed to us in Jesus Christ, and his chapters on 'The Significance of Jesus' and 'The Other-worldliness of Christianity' would in themselves, because of their penetration, beauty, and spiritual power, be sufficient to place the book on a high level of excellence.

THE HERODS OF JUDÆA.

In *The Herods of Judæa* (Milford; 8s. 6d. net) Mr. A. H. M. Jones, Fellow of All Soul's College, essays to write pure history. We are apt to think of that age from the standpoint of our interest in Christianity. But the Christian movement was a mere incident, and a trivial one, at that time. It had not for contemporaries the importance we assign to it. And Mr. Jones's aim is to counteract this propensity to give to the Christian faith a disproportionate prominence, and to tell the story of a remarkable family objectivity. And, as he points out, the story as such is both important and engrossing for two reasons. One is that round the Herods raged the conflict over Hellenism. It was the steady aim of all the Herods to reconcile the Jews to Hellenistic ideals and customs. The other is that the Herodian kingdoms are the only examples of client kingdoms under the Roman system of which we have intimate knowledge.

This book is a masterly performance. The events dealt with form an intricate pattern, but the author pursues a clear path, never losing the wood because of the trees. He enables us by his firm grasp of essentials and his admirable historical perspective to follow the course of events easily. And, in particular, he lets us see how capable most of the Herods were, and even how enlightened, according to the standards of their day. It is a fascinating tale, and all who are interested in Christian origins, and particularly concerned to see the background against which the Christian tradition was developed, will learn a great deal from this brilliant study.

Even Jove nods sometimes, however. We are not acquainted with the saying the author quotes: 'Can any good thing come out of Galilee?' And is he right in saying that under Rome the rule of a native king was preferred to that of a Roman governor in districts where the population was intractable? Was it not the other way? Judæans were most intractable people, and they had a Roman governor. Galileans were easier to rule, and they had their own prince. It ought to be added that there is a series of maps at the end of the book which are skilfully drawn and most enlightening.

THE MARRIAGE BILL.

Mr. A. P. Herbert, the senior M.P. for Oxford University, has written the story of the Marriage Bill. He gives it the title, *The Ayes Have It* (Methuen; 6s. net). It is difficult to believe that the history of any Act of Parliament has ever been written before in such an interesting and racy way. Besides the knowledge that one gets of the actual contents of the Act, and the reasons for their action of those who opposed it and those who stood its friend, one acquires incidentally and in the easiest way an excellent knowledge of parliamentary machinery. And also incidentally of the working of proportional representation. In the House of Lords the Bill was supported by the Bishops of Birmingham, Chichester, Coventry, Durham, and Manchester. In the end, Mr. Herbert says, only one Bishop (St. Albans) voted against the Bill. The Archbishop of Canterbury abstained from voting.

Now that the Marriage Bill, 1936, has become the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1937, and has been in force since the first of January of this year, let us see what are the grounds to-day for divorce. (It should be noted that the Act does not apply to Scotland.)

'A petition for divorce may be presented to the High Court (in this part of this Act referred to as "the court") either by the husband or the wife on the ground that the respondent:

(*a*) 'has since the celebration of the marriage committed adultery; or

(*b*) 'has deserted the petitioner without cause for a period of at least three years immediately preceding the presentation of the petition; or

(*c*) 'has since the celebration of the marriage treated the petitioner with cruelty; or

(*d*) 'is incurably of unsound mind and has been continuously under care and treatment for a period of at least five years immediately preceding the presentation of the petition;

and by the wife on the ground that her husband has, since the celebration of the marriage, been guilty of rape, sodomy, or bestiality.'

The Act also gives new grounds for decree of nullity.

(*a*) 'that the marriage has not been consummated owing to the wilful refusal of the respondent to consummate the marriage; or

(*b*) 'that either party to the marriage was at the time of the marriage of unsound mind or a mental defective within the meaning of the Mental Deficiency Acts, 1913 to 1927, or subject to recurrent fits of insanity or epilepsy; or

(*c*) 'that the respondent was at the time of the marriage suffering from venereal disease in a communicable form; or

(*d*) 'that the respondent was at the time of the marriage pregnant by some person other than the petitioner.'

In the working of the Act the divorce clause which has given most trouble is (*d*)—the one dealing with persons who are incurably of unsound mind. The word 'incurable' was not in the Bill originally, but Mr. Herbert was obliged to compromise here to meet his opponents. Now it is found that doctors are very unwilling to give evidence that patients, even when they have been receiving treatment for many years, are incurable. It is to be hoped that a way out of this difficulty will be found.

A very interesting little book has been written by a team of Americans on the place of recreation in life and what the Church can do to encourage and organize it—*Recreation in Church and Community*, edited by Mr. Warren T. Powell (Abingdon Press; 75 c.). It is a small book but, by dint of close printing (which, however, is quite clear), a great deal of matter is packed into the limited space. The work is done very thoroughly, and all who are interested in the formative and even religious value of recreation will find much here that will both enlighten and stimulate.

The Church and the World, Vol. I. (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net), is offered as a companion to the historical study of Christian sociology. Its authors are Canon Cyril E. Hudson, M.A., who has already contributed to the subject of Christian sociology, and the Rev. Maurice B. Reckitt, Editor of 'Christendom.' The book is not strictly a 'source book,' since original authorities are quoted but rarely. But it is a 'source book' in an extended sense of the phrase, since contemporary authorities—like Harnack and Troeltsch, A. J. Carlyle, R. H. Tawney, and G. O'Brien—are quoted freely. Indeed, what the authors have done is to assemble quotations from contemporary authorities and link them together by a commentary of their own. The result is not a book of literary merit, but a handy introduction and guide to a great field of study.

The first part, 'The Ancient World,' begins with Israel and takes us through early Christian history to the so-called 'dark ages.' The second part, 'Christendom,' opens with the rise of the Carlovingian Empire and ends with the death of Dante. The second volume will also consist of two parts, the first dealing with the period from the Avignon Captivity down to the close of the eighteenth century, and the second concentrating upon the religious and social situation in England from the Oxford Movement to the present day.

In countries like India the missionary is increasingly confronted with, and sometimes perplexed by, the criticism 'we do not want Christianity, look at your home-country, what has Christianity made of it? We do not want India to be like Britain.' All, missionaries or not, who feel that there is enough truth in this criticism to sting, would do well to read Professor Heinrich Frick's little book, *The Gospel: Christianity and Other Faiths* (Blackwell; 3s. 6d. net). Professor Frick shows how we have been mistaken in simply drawing a contrast between two things—Christianity on the one hand, non-Christian Faiths on the other. We have got to think of a triangle—the Gospel, Christianity, and non-Christian Faiths. By the gospel is meant that true way of life which no so-called Christian country has ever exhibited as a whole community; by Christianity is meant the degree to which Christian principles have prevailed, off-set by the degree to which they have failed to find general recognition in practice. The missionary must say, 'I ask you, and my own people too—my own people as much as you—to accept the gospel and to live in accordance with it.'

The little book was well worth translation into our tongue; and it has been well translated by Professor James Haire, of Belfast.

It seems next to impossible to find the real truth about Russia. Apparently equally well-informed observers come back with totally opposite reports. And this applies to the truth about religion in Russia as much as to its economic conditions. The Rev. Thomas L. Harris, the author of *Unholy Pilgrimage* (T. & T. Clark; 5s. net), went out to see what he could see about Russian religion, and he has given a favourable report of Russian life, but has little to say that is good of the religious life of the people. His book and his attitude are both curious. He is apparently a clergyman of the Episcopal Church in the United States. But his own religious convictions are obscure. 'The command, "Be ye perfect," encourages both hypocrisy and scrupulosity.' Incidentally it is our Lord's command! 'The strength of belief in survival is morbid egotism, coupled with an intolerable sense of frustration.' 'I was not surprised to find that the divorce of morality from religion benefited morality; ethics and religion often suffer from incompatibility of temperament.' 'The cultivation of truth has never been common among ecclesiastics and statesmen.' These sentiments are representative of an attitude which persists throughout the book. How they can be squared with the position of a priest is not clear. At any rate the writer gives us a very frank statement of his reactions to what he saw and heard as he travelled about the country. It is all interesting, often provoking, sometimes bewildering, but always honest. How far it is revealing we are left wondering.

Recoveries in Religion, by the Rev. Ralph W. Sockman (Cokesbury Press; $2.00), is a book full of keen and shrewd criticism of the present situation in the social and religious world. The writer, however, is not a mere critic, as so many are; he is, above all, positive and constructive in his teaching. The 'recoveries' he deals with are the Recovery of Authority, of Balance, of Radiance, of Power, and of Preaching. On the whole, he takes a broad and hopeful outlook, and his view-point is thoroughly Christian and very sane. He has read widely and thought much, and has many wise things to say. After remarking on the insufficiency of much of the teaching and practice of to-day he ventures the prediction: 'the nineteenth century gave its emphasis to charting the laws of nature, the twentieth century will explore the grace of God. If, in our scientific age, as in apostolic time, the study of law prove the tutor which leads to divine grace, then we shall recover the power of God unto salvation.'

Professor A. S. Peake is still vividly remembered by many, and his work in theology warmly appreciated. During the last ten years of his life he edited the *Holborn Review*, and in it he frequently paid tribute to eminent scholars. He had the happy knack of brightening these articles by personal reminiscences, for he had been in close touch with many of the leading minds of his time. A number of these articles are now collected and published under the title of *Recollections and Appreciations*, edited by the Rev. W. F. Howard, D.D. (Epworth Press; 6s. net). There are forty to fifty in all. They comprise two great editors (William Robertson Nicoll and James Hastings), an Oxford triumvirate (Sanday, Cheyne, and Driver), about a dozen Old Testament scholars and the same number of New Testament scholars, with some half-dozen who are not classified. They are all very brief appreciations, barely even thumb-nail sketches, but they are vividly written, and they give some interesting impressions of the great scholars of the pre-war era as seen through the eyes of one who moved among them as their equal.

We welcome and would draw special attention to a revised and enlarged edition of Principal Vincent Taylor's *The Gospels: A Short Introduction*. This book first appeared in 1930, and this is now the fourth edition—a fact that in itself shows how valuable the Introduction has proved. The type has been entirely reset in the present edition, and all the information brought up to date. For those who do not know the volume we might explain that it treats questions of sources, date, and authorship, and the mutual relations of one gospel to another. The publishers are the Epworth Press, and the price is 3s. 6d. net.

Some devout compiler who chooses to remain anonymous has put together the whole story of Jesus in a simple narrative. It is issued under the title of *The Combined Gospels founded on the A.V.* (Heffer; 5s. net). No attempt is made at harmonizing, but passages are selected from the four Gospels to make a consecutive narrative of ninety-six chapters, all in the language of the Authorized Version. The choice of passages seems at times arbitrary, as, for example, when the disputed conclusion of Mark's Gospel is chosen in preference to the others. An elaborate index at the end gives verse by verse references to the original texts. The book is in handy pocket form, clearly printed and beautifully got up.

The Bishop of Ely, as Chairman of the Church of England Men's Society, has had his thoughts directed to the case of those who, while forming no doubt the majority of the worshippers in the Church, 'might not find it easy to meet the challenge of an inquirer who should say to them, "You are constantly repeating the Apostles' Creed, and presumably you understand what you say. Would you explain to me what you mean?"' For such people he has written an explanation of the articles of the Christian faith as contained in the Apostles' Creed, under the title of *This is Our Faith* (Hodder and Stoughton; 5s. net). It does not profess to be a book for scholars, but for plain people both inside the Church and outside. It is at once expository and apologetic. Some may feel that the Bishop is too comfortable in his orthodoxy, and does not appreciate keenly enough the difficulties felt by others. But his book is most readable and full of sound sense. There are points where he seems to add to the œcumenical creed views which are peculiar to his own denomination, but in general his exposition is fair and lucid, while his reasoning, without being profound, is convincing.

Emeritus-Professor G. Dawes Hicks, M.A., Ph.D., Litt.D., has done philosophy a service in publishing *Critical Realism: Studies in the Philosophy of Mind and Nature* (Macmillan; 15s. net). The book consists of twelve essays; eleven of them have appeared in various magazines, but these have been revised and in some cases amended. The collection is prefaced by an introductory chapter. The subjects handled are sufficiently described by the chapter headings: the Basis of Critical Realism, the Sensum Theory, Sensible Appearances and Material Things, the Nature of Images, Conceptual Thought and Real Existence, Bradley's Treatment of Nature, the Dynamic Aspect of Nature, Eddington's Philosophy of Nature, Is the Mind a Compound Substance? the Refutation of Idealism, the Philosophical Researches of Meinong, the 'Modes' of Spinoza and the 'Monads' of Leibniz. The number of those who will feel at home in all the chapters is small; on the other hand, many will find not only interest but illumination in one or another topic. Dr. Hicks is a profound thinker and an incisive critic but always a lucid writer. There is scarcely a name or a movement in recent philosophy that he does not evaluate; and not the least service which his book is fitted to render is the demonstration of how very active and many-sided philosophical thought has been in an age that on the surface seems to afford little encouragement to deep thinking. Of course, as Dr. Hicks shows, there has been a considerable amount of so-called philosophy in recent times that can scarcely be called profound.

In the present disturbed state of the world, where are we to look for a way out? Dr. Herbert Lockyer says 'in the Second Coming of Christ.' This answer he develops in *The Rapture of Saints* (Pickering & Inglis; 1s. net). Some of the questions raised here are: How will the Advent take place? Any signs of its nearness? What should be our attitude to it? Believers in the close approach of the Second Coming should find this book to their mind.

With fine literary touch the late Dr. Walter Howard Frere, former Bishop of Truro, has made a noteworthy contribution to the English literature of Liturgiology with his *The Anaphora or Great Eucharistic Prayer* (S.P.C.K.; 8s. 6d. net). Dr. Frere wrote with two practical ends in view: first, to afford guidance to those who have to construct a Eucharistic liturgy for new churches in the mission field; second, to guide revisers of the Anglican Prayer-Book. He deplores the mistakes made—presumably by some very high Anglo-Catholics—which mistakes imitate, and would perpetuate mistakes in the Roman liturgy which Roman liturgiologists recognize. To revise worthily, we must get back to the richness of the conception underlying the true line of the most ancient liturgies. That line was undoubtedly Trinitarian; and the Roman Mass, as it developed, did not do justice to the Holy Spirit. At the Reformation ignorance of the true aim of the ancient Catholic Church in her Anaphora led to intensifying the Roman error. All this, it may seem, concerns only the Anglican Church. That, however, is only partially true. Most churches have been occupied with providing not prescribed but pattern forms of Communion Service; and Dr. Frere's scholarly study should be in the hands of all who are entrusted with, or take upon themselves, so difficult a task. Apart from its practical purpose, the book is a valuable historical investigation.

Those who have to deal with young people in Bible classes or study circles might with great advantage read a new book by Professor Clement F. Rogers, M.A., *Verify Your References: Studies in Popular Apologetics* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). Professor Rogers is well known for his 'Lectures in Hyde Park' and many similar books, and for his skill in controversy. You need to be alert and well-informed if you are going to face a Hyde Park crowd. In this book the author quotes many misstatements made by members of that crowd, and proceeds to answer them. These statements are amazing in their blatant inaccuracy, but they are repeated and believed by the uninstructed 'enquirer.' They are bandied about in factories and workshops, and asserted with calm assurance as undoubted truths. No one can deal with such matters like Professor Rogers, and in this book he not only instructs but entertains us with his reminiscences of his encounters in the Park.

The Makers of the New Testament, by the Rev. R. L. Pelly, Canon of Newcastle (S.C.M.; 2s. net), is not a book on the making of the New Testament. It is an attempt to draw the portraits of the men who made the New Testament. The author has taken pains to learn all that historical criticism has to tell us about these men. But he does not confine himself to 'facts.' He makes 'the dry bones of criticism live by clothing them with the warm flesh of imagination.' These words from the Introduction make us fear the worst. But happily our fears are belied. When Canon Pelly spreads his wings he tries to keep in touch with reality. The evidence for his statements is given in every case, and when he goes beyond it he does not go very far or out of reach of probability. The 'Portraits' are James, Mark, Saul, Paul, Luke, and 'John the Elder.' The last of these is the most interesting. He is regarded as the writer, if not the author, of the Fourth Gospel.

The second part of the book deals with 'The Unknown Great,' the anonymous authors of 'Matthew,' Hebrews, 1 Peter, Revelation, Jude, and 2 Peter. This is an interesting book, with real scholarship at its foundation and a great deal of humanity in its make-up.

Church and State in the Apologists.

By the Reverend William Barclay, B.D., Renfrew.

It would seem on the face of it that there could be no more law-abiding citizen of the Roman Empire than a Christian. A Christian was a man trained and schooled in obedience; it was the deliberate teaching of the greatest exponents of the faith that those set in authority must be honoured and obeyed. 'Every subject must obey the government authorities,' said Paul, 'for no authority exists apart from God; the existing authorities have been constituted by God. Hence any one who resists authority is opposing the divine order, and the opposition will bring judgment on themselves. . . . the magistrate is God's servant for your benefit . . . a magistrate does not wield the power of the sword for nothing, he is God's servant for the infliction of divine vengeance upon evildoers' (Ro $13^{1. 2. 4}$, Moffatt). 'Submit,' said Peter, 'for the Lord's sake to any human authority; submit to the emperor as supreme, and to governors as deputed by him for the punishment of wrongdoers and the encouragement of honest people' (1 P 2^{13}, Moffatt). 'My very first counsel,' said Paul, 'is that supplications, prayers, petitions, and thanksgiving are to be offered for all men—for kings and all in authority, that we may lead a tranquil life in all piety and gravity' (1 Ti $2^{1. 2}$, Moffatt). With such instructions ringing in their ears and written on their hearts it is difficult to see how any body of men could acquire the reputation of law-breakers and involve themselves in the severest penalties that the law could inflict. And yet that is precisely what happened. Our task is to find some explanation of how such devotion to the State could bring upon its own head the persecution of the first three Christian centuries.

It is to be noted, in the first place, that the Christians themselves had on this and every other matter the clearest of consciences. The proof of this is that time and time again they insist that they had nothing to hide; time and time again, so far from running away from the law of the State, they deliberately invite that law to make the closest possible investigation of their manner of life and of their beliefs. There is scarcely a single apologist who does not demand investigation of the Christian faith by the authorities. It is Tertullian's opening plea for Christianity, 'Unum gestit interdum, ne ignorata damnetur' (*Ap.*, 1). 'One thing only does she eagerly desire in the meantime, that she be not condemned without being known.' Tatian concludes his apology with the invitation, 'I present myself to you ready to give answer for my beliefs' (*Or. ad Graec.*, 42), speaking like a man ready to undergo any cross-examination on the substance of the things he held to be true and on the manner of the life he led. Athenagoras (*Suppl.*, 1), after speaking of the toleration that others enjoyed and the blamelessness of the Christian way, goes on to say, 'We venture to unfold to you a statement of our case—and as the discourse proceeds you will discover that we are suffering without justice and contrary to law and reason—and we entreat you to make some investigation of our affairs so that we may cease to be slaughtered by false accusers.' It is plainly his belief that a true statement of the Christian position, listened to without prejudice, cannot fail to bring immunity. Justin Martyr (i. 2) begs that the emperor should pass judgment 'after an accurate and searching investigation.' He goes further (i. 3): 'We demand,' he says, 'that the charges against the Christians be investigated, and that if these be substantiated they be punished as they deserve.' It is Lactantius's supreme complaint that the authorities will not listen to a statement of the case; 'they are afraid lest if they should hear they should be unable to condemn' (*Div. Instit.*, v. 1). Minucius Felix attributes it to the work of demons that 'Men begin to hate us before they know us' (*Oct.*, 27).

One and all, these apologists demand investigation. Now men who conceived of themselves as breaking the laws would not beseech examination under these same laws; men who conceived of themselves as being enemies of the State would not have as their dearest wish that the same State should examine their most cherished beliefs. It is plain that these apologists did not see anything in their faith which would necessarily set them at enmity with the State.

More than that—they frequently, and in the most devoted terms, express their utmost loyalty to State and to emperor. The only reservation they make, and they did not see that it was the all-important one, was that they would not worship Cæsar as a god. 'The Emperor bids me pay my taxes,' said Tatian; 'I am ready to offer them. The master bids me be a slave and a servant

I freely recognize my servitude. A man is to be honoured as a man; God alone is to be feared' (*Or. ad Graec.*, 4). Justin declares, 'God alone will we worship; but gladly we will serve you, acknowledging you freely to be kings and rulers of men, and praying that you may be found to have a wise understanding together with a royal power.' Tertullian goes even further (*Ap.*, 24) when he declares that the emperor belongs far more to the Christians than he does to the Romans, for it is the firm belief of the Christians that their God put him where he is.

Again and again the apologists cite the fact that they always pray for the emperor as a proof of their loyalty to him. 'Night and day,' says Cyprian, 'we beseech the mercy and the grace of God for your peace and safety' (*Ad. Demetrian*, 20). 'I will honour the king,' says Theophilus of Antioch, 'not by worshipping him, but rather by praying for him. . . . Honour the king and seek his good by being obedient to him and by praying for him' (*Ad. Autol.*, i. 11). It is the plea of Athenagoras that of all men the Christians are most worthy to have their requests granted because they pray for the empire, praying that the succession may pass in peace from father to son, praying that the empire may grow great and all its foes be subjected (*Suppl.*, 37). Arnobius demands why the books of the Christians should be burned, being such as they are; and why their meetings should be broken up with such ferocity when at these very meetings the Christians pray to the most high God for the welfare and the pardon of magistrates, armies and kings, friends and enemies (*Arn.*, iv. 36).

There can be no doubt that, whatever the government thought of them, the Christians conceived of themselves as the loyalest of citizens; however disruptive an element the authorities might believe them to be, they believed themselves to be devoted to the highest welfare of the State and of the emperor.

Wherein, then, lies the reason of this clash between the Christian Church and the Roman State? How is it that the Christians apparently so loyal became known as enemies of the State? It is necessary, to explain this divergence, to form a correct conception of the Roman idea of religion and in particular of Cæsar worship. For the Christians the alternative was in reality Cæsar or Christ. Time and time again in the stories of the martyrdoms the Christian was asked the question, Are you or are you not willing to do homage to the genius of Cæsar? Always they said, No; and that refusal always ended in death. The thing that has constantly to be borne in mind is that Cæsar worship had far more a political than a religious significance to the official mind. It was, in fact, not primarily a religious thing at all; it was in its essence a political thing. The magistrate's demand that a man on trial should signify his reverence to the emperor was not nearly so much a test of the man's religious belief as a test of his loyalty and of his political soundness.

No nation was ever confronted with such a problem in government as was the Roman State. They had an empire which was, to all intents and purposes, world-wide. It was composed of the most widely differing elements; there were in it all sorts of temperaments and characters and sorts and conditions of men. And the problem that faced the government was how to convert this heterogeneous mass into something like a unified whole. They sought to find that unifying principle in Cæsar worship. It was not really the emperor who was to be thought of as a god; it was the State which was god. The emperor was deified as the personification of the State, and therefore to worship his godhead was to proclaim yourself a true and devoted citizen of Rome. Cæsar worship was an attempt to find the one unifying principle which would bind all together by one common loyalty; but this loyalty was raised above loyalty and made into worship. Had the Christian signified first his loyalty to Cæsar as a god he might then have gone away and worshipped any god he liked, provided only that that worship did not endanger public safety and public morals, for by first showing his loyalty he would have showed himself a good public citizen and might thereafter choose his own private religion. That is, in fact, what the devotees of the other cults did, and that is precisely what no Christian could do. It has been said that the Roman mind could not understand nonconformity. It would be more correct to say that the Roman official mind could not afford nonconformity.

The Christians refused to conform on two grounds, and they are the two grounds which are the elemental realities in the conflict between Church and State in any age. The one is not strictly a religious ground; it is grounded in the fundamental rights of man; it is the eternal principle at the heart of Protestantism; it is the principle that every man has the right to worship the god of his own choice and that only such worship is of any religious value.

Athenagoras appeals to that ground. He enumerates the many religions that flourish unchecked within the empire; they are permitted in the belief that to believe in no god is an impious thing and that for a man to believe in the god of his own choice is the way to keep him from sin. And then he demands why a like liberty of choice is not accorded to the Christians (*Suppl.*, 1). That is more an appeal to precedent than an appeal to principle. Tertullian protests against this taking away of 'liberty of worship' and the forbidding of the choice of a god ('adimere libertatem religionis et interdicere optionem divinitatis'), for, he says, 'no one, not even a man, would desire to be worshipped by some one against his will' (*Apol.*, 24). He is laying down the principle that the value of worship is wholly dependent upon the freedom of worship. It is to Lactantius, the most philosophic of all the apologists, that we must turn for the fullest exposition of this principle. He says: 'If by bloodshed, if by torture, if by evil, you seek to defend religion, she is not defended; she is violated and polluted. There is nothing so spontaneous as religion; if the mind of the man who is making the sacrifice is turned away, religion is destroyed and becomes nothing' (*Div. Instit.*, v. 20). Again he says: 'We may well ask them (*i.e.* the persecutors) whom do they specially wish to benefit by forcing men to sacrifice against their will? Can it be those whom they force? But it is no benefit which is forced upon some one who refuses it. But, they may say, those who do not know what is to their own good must have their own interests consulted even against their will. But why do they cruelly tear and crucify and take away all the strength from those whose welfare they seek? Or whence is such impious piety that they wretchedly ruin and destroy those whose interests they wish to consult? Or can it be that they think they are benefiting the gods? But that is no sacrifice which is forced from some one against his will. Unless it be spontaneously and freely made, it is a cursed thing' (*Div. Instit.*, v. 20). That is a perfect statement of the fundamental fact that worship unless it be free is of value neither to the worshipper who gives it nor to the god who receives it.

To that principle the apologists appealed; it is a true principle and it is an eternal principle; but it was useless in dealing with a government who looked upon a State religion as a method of demonstrating, not soundness of doctrine and heart, but soundness of political faith.

The second ground to which the apologists appeal is a definitely religious ground. It is a later development; I do not think that it can be said to emerge full grown until Origen. All the early apologists had conceived of themselves as entirely law-abiding citizens; but Origen faced the real situation; the situation of the Christian as a law-breaker of the laws of men for the sake of the laws of God. He faces it fairly and squarely in the first chapter of the first book against Celsus. Celsus has accused the Christians of being law-breakers. It was undeniably true; they were an illegal association, and every meeting was a breach of the law. Origen admits it. Suppose, he says, that a man had to dwell among the Scythians and their laws were the reverse of justice; and suppose that he had no opportunity to escape; would he not then be justified in breaking the laws of the Scythians for the sake of the law of truth? Later on, in the same work, Origen gives to this principle, that the law of God must take precedence over the law of man, its fullest and its noblest exposition. 'There are in general two laws facing us—the one, the law of nature, of which God is the legislator; the other, the written law of cities. When the written law is not opposed to the law of God, it is fitting for the citizens not to abandon it for any strange customs. But when the law of nature, that is, the law of God, commands what is in opposition to the written law, see whether reason will not tell us to bid a long farewell to the written code and to the desire of its legislators and to give ourselves up to the legislator God, and to choose a life agreeable to His word, although in so doing it may be necessary to encounter dangers and countless labours and even death and dishonour' (c. Cels., v. 37). Origen has come to the supreme point. The laws of earth and the laws of God may clash; in such a case the laws of earth must go; and only a man's conscience can tell him when that point has been reached.

In his first meeting with Mary Queen of Scots, John Knox had to state this very same point to her. 'Ye have taught the people,' said the Queen, 'to receive another religion than their princes can allow. How can that doctrine be of God, seeing that God commands subjects to obey their princes?' And Knox answered, 'Madam, as right religion took neither original strength nor authority from worldly princes, but from the Eternal God alone, subjects are not bound to frame their religion according to the appetites of their princes.'[1] That is what all the apologists were unconsciously saying until Origen met and faced the problem and brought it out into the open. The conflict between State and Church in the Early Church was founded on the dilemma of the two laws—the law of God and the law of man; and the dilemma will last until the law of God and the law of man become one law, and that the law of God.

---

[1] *History of the Reformation in Scotland*, by John Knox (20th century ed., revised and edited by Cuthbert Lennox), p. 233.

εἰ μὴ εἷς Θεός—A Suggestion.

By the Reverend Eric F. F. Bishop, Newman School of Missions, Thabor, Jerusalem.

In reading the Gospel of St. Mark in Syriac some days ago my Syriac teacher demurred at the customary English translation of the unspoken reasoning of the Scribes and Pharisees, when they heard our Lord say to the paralytic, 'Thy sins be forgiven thee.' Their reaction, according to the R.V., took the form of 'Who can forgive sins but one, *even* God?' Of course it was a rhetorical question, and might just as easily have taken the form of a statement. 'No one can forgive sins except God alone.'

The phrase generally rendered in this way, or in words to this effect, occurs twice in St. Mark.[1] The first is in the case of the healing of the paralytic, where the reaction is on the part of men steeped in the monotheism of Judaism; the second is when Our Lord answered one question with another, 'Good Master, what must I do to inherit eternal life? Why callest thou me good? There is none good, but one; *that is* God.'

In the first case Matthew omits the sentence entirely; while Luke substitutes *μόνος* for εἷς.[2] In the second instance the phrase is abbreviated in Matthew to 'One there is who is good' (R.V.), unless the longer and presumably assimilated reading be preferred.[3] Luke here retains Mark's phrasing, as it is, though some authorities omit the article before Θεός.[4]

There are but few variations in the text of Mk 2^{7}, but 'D' reads εἰ μη ὁ Θεός, omitting εἷς; while the Old Latin texts all follow 'd,' which has *nisi solus Deus*, except 'a' (the fourth century Vercellensis) which reads *nisi unus Deus*.

The Codex Bezae is more interesting when it comes to Mk 10^{18}, for 'D' has εἰ μὴ μόνος εἷς Θεός, and 'd' follows suit with *nisi solus unus Deus*, which is also the reading of the Palestinian Syriac. 'ff' reads *nisi unus solus Deus*, which is also the reading of the Egyptian versions, Sahidic and Bohairic; while 'b' has *unus ac solus Deus*. Augustine quotes the phrase twice *nemo bonus nisi unus Deus*, while Origen in several contexts has εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ Θεός ὁ πατηρ.[5] This reading of Origen's is very important, because in the parallel passage in Luke 'd' reads *nisi unus Deus Pater*. Suffice it to say here that *unus* and *solus* cannot mean the same thing any more than *μόνος* and εἷς.

Turning to the English versions we find the R.V. rendering the words in Mk 2^{7}, 'but one, even God,' and in 10^{18}, 'save one, even God.' This is at all events consistent. Turner claims that the A.V. is right in 2^{7}, but that both our versions are wrong in 10^{18}. We ought to render 'God only.' This seems rather arbitrary; and it is good to find the modern translators inconsistent, with the exception of Weymouth, who has 'but one—that is God,' in each case. In 2^{7}, Moffatt and Goodspeed agree with the rendering of 'but God alone.' Torrey and Lamsa have 'but (except) God only' This all comes to practically the same thing; but in translating 10^{18} there are the following variations:

> 'No one is good, no one, but God' (Moffatt).
> 'No one is good but God' (Goodspeed).
> 'Only one is good, namely God' (Torrey).
> 'There is no one who is good, except the one God' (Lamsa).

Curiously enough, Lamsa does not apparently recognize his translation in 10^{18} as differing from that of the ordinary versions.[6] Perhaps he just 'felt' that 'except the one God' was the right way of putting it, just as the Syriac teacher in Jerusalem was certain that 'Who can forgive sins, except the one God?' was the only way of rendering Mk 2^{7}. The phrase itself does not seem to have interested the commentators overmuch, although the Semitic stress on the divine unity, referred to (again) in Mk 12^{29}, does have some attention in that context. St. Luke, however, seems to have thought there was a difference as between the two occurrences of the phrase, or he would surely have altered εἷς in the second case to *μόνος* as well.[7] Perhaps it was he who really set the ball rolling towards the usual interpretation of Mk 2^{7}, and then for some reason or other decided against changing in 10^{18}. But what if Lamsa is right in his instinctive rendering? And if he is right in this second case, why should he have followed the traditional interpretation in the first? If 'There is no one who is good, except the One God,' rightly construes Mk 10^{18}, why should not ‘Who can forgive sins except the One God?’ be the correct interpretation of 2^{7}?

---

[1] Mk 2^{7} 10^{18}.

[2] Lk 5^{21}: though 'D' has εἷς.

[3] Mt 19^{17}.

[4] Lk. 18^{19}.

[5] Cf. 1 Co 8^{6}.

[6] *The Gospels from Aramaic*, 88.

[7] Unless 'D' is correct at Mk 2^{7}.

Perhaps we have a key in Dr. Torrey’s rendering of Mt 19^{17}, where he translates: ‘Why do you ask me about the good thing? The good is one.’ He adds that ‘as the parallels in Mk and Lk show, the saying was misinterpreted almost from the first.’ He thinks that ‘the good is one’ was ‘too philosophical’ for popular audiences—hence came a reconstruction in the Matthean text based on Mark and Luke.[1] Surely, however, if Dr. Torrey is correct in his criticism, the sentence might just as well be read the other way round, and give us ‘the one is good.’ This is the order of both Greek and Latin columns of the Codex Bezae. There could hardly be any doubt in the mind of any hearer of the story, who had a Semitic background, that by ‘the one’ was meant God; and this would not be the only time in the First Gospel, where the Jewish evasion of pronouncing the name of God was recognized. If this is the right interpretation, however, is the formula in Matthew so very different from that in Mark and Luke with the adoption of Lamsa’s rendering? In Matthew there is the straightforward statement, ‘the one is good’; in Mark and Luke we have, perhaps, the more natural way of putting things in the near east, the great negation succeeded by the greater affirmation. ‘There is no deity at all, except Allah,’ the pious Muslim has been saying for generations every day. ‘There is no one who is good, except God,’ said Jesus to one *au fait* with the precepts of the Torah.

There is no definite article either in Aramaic or Syriac which may account both for its occurrences and non-occurrences in the Greek. Mark has it in both cases; Luke is doubtful in the second. But it is really immaterial. On the other hand, if there is anything in the suggestion that in ὁ Θεός we have the Markan interpretation of εἷς for Roman readers, it is more understandable why he should insert the article before Θεός as rightly meaning God, the insistence on whose unity seems to have been a common and necessary feature of the early preaching of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. And to translate εἷς as ‘alone’ or ‘only’ is surely redundant. It adds nothing. The Muslim might just as well say, ‘There is no deity but Allah *alone*,’ but this would not be any clearer than the simpler statement. It is worth while perhaps noting in this connexion the introductory words of Surat al Ikhlas, ‘Say, Allah (he) is one,’ where the word for one is closely allied to the Syriac form, but only occurs in respect of Allah in this passage in the Qur’an.[2] This Sura is in the first Meccan group and dates therefore from the early preaching days when Muhammad was in very close touch with the Jews.

Otherwise the word used in the Qur’an for the ‘one God’ is ‘*Wahid*,’ the more usual form. ‘*Wahid*’ is the sixty-sixth of the ninety-nine beautiful names of Allah, and there are six occasions of its occurrence in this connexion. All are in suras belonging to the second or third Meccan group, in the years immediately preceding the *Hijra*, and the word is followed each time by the epithet ‘*Qahhar*’ (conqueror), both words being definite. There are, however, fifteen occasions when ‘*Wahid*’ is used indefinitely, not with Allah but with *’ilah*. Twelve of these are in the nominative case; three in the accusative. Allah is supposed by some people to have arisen by the contracting of ‘*Al-ilah*’ (the deity); but since the Syriac word for God was *Alohoh*, others have felt it more probable that it was taken straight over into Islam from Syriac-speaking Christianity. In any case there is both Jewish and Christian monotheism at the back of the Islamic insistence on the unity of God.

Thus Dr. Torrey in *The Jewish Background of Islam*: ‘The strict monotheism, which has always been characteristic of Islam, was nowhere more sharply pronounced than in the Koran. It was not a new idea in pagan Arabia, but the extraordinary emphasis given to the doctrine by Muhammad was the result of Jewish teaching.’[3]

Over the similarity between *Allah* and *Alohoh*, Professor Bell writes: ‘That the name Allah is borrowed I should not like to assert categorically. We sometimes find the proper Arabic form *al-’ilah*, and *Allah* may have arisen by contraction. Still it is very like the Syriac term *Alaha*, and that Christian form of the name and the Christian idea, penetrating along with it, had probably some influence on the ideas of the Arabs and upon the form which their name for the supreme deity assumed.’[4]

It is besides worth noting that the word ‘*al-qahhar*,’ ‘the conqueror,’ is always used of Allah in direct connexion with ‘*al-wahid*,’ the implication probably being that Allah, the One, had obtained His supremacy over the other gods of Arabia, and, as has been noted, these verses containing the words ‘*al-wahid*’ and ‘*al-qahhar*’ occur in suras which belong to the Meccan period of Muhammad's activity, when his main concern was the establishment of the divine unity. There is another small point which concerns the actual pronunciation of the Syriac and Arabic words for God. In his *The Phonetics of Arabic* Canon Gairdner calls attention to the fact that only in the divine name do the Arab phoneticians recognize a 'velarised' 'L,' otherwise when the thick sound occurs, it is due to the presence in the word of one or other of the heavy letters. A similar phenomenon occurs in the Syriac ALOHOH, when the a-sound is broadened deliberately when the word is used for the One God, as opposed to those 'there be that are called gods.' The same idea occurs in the lengthening of the ordinary Arabic word for 'father' in order to express the idea of the Heavenly Father, when a '*madda*' is placed over the *alif*.[1] Whether there is any greater connexion between these factors other than that of a common Semitic feeling it may be unwise to decide. But the facts remain whatever the interpretation.

---

[1] *The Four Gospels*, ad. loc. and *Our Translated Gospels*, 16, 20.

[2] Sura 112. Arabic ‘’Ahad’: Syriac ‘Had.’ The word ‘Allah’ is unpluralizable.

[3] P. 54.

[4] *The Origin of Islam in its Christian Environment*, 54.

It is true also that the phrase 'wahdahu'[2] occurs six times in the Qur'an more or less in the sense in which St. Luke interprets St. Mark's εἷς by using μόνος. These instances, however, do not appear in contexts that concern what Allah is or what Allah does, but whether He alone by Himself is believed in or worshipped. But every Muslim knows that in His nature and His attributes and His actions Allah is unique; and this deep-seated conviction is owed to a surrounding Judaism and Christianity more than to any other factors—and supremely to Judaism. The 'unforgivable sin' so far as Islam is concerned is *shirk*, or the joining of other gods or anything else with Allah.[3] It was indeed some such doctrine as this that, with all its ramifications, was so ingrained in the hearts of the Scribes and Pharisees when our Lord said to the paralytic, 'Thy sins be forgiven thee,' that their natural reaction was 'This man blasphemeth,' not just because He said that He could forgive sins, but because the very suggestion militated against the conviction of the divine unity. 'Who can forgive sins but the one God?'

So, too, in the second case (and Swete is certainly correct in saying that the stress is on ἀγαθός and not on the pronoun) if goodness is the attribute of the One God, the questioner over eternal life had to be reminded of the seriousness of his use of the word 'good.' It could not be employed lightly. Goodness was predicated of the One God; that was known from the Psalms and the Prophets, even from Chronicles; the man who used the term must be aware that 'there is none good save the One God.' There is surely reason for the suggestion that this is a possible rendering of the words, especially in the light of the third reference to the divine unity in Mk 12^{29}, with the quotation from Deuteronomy, 'The Lord our God, the Lord is one'; and the answer of the scribe, recorded only in Mark, 'Of a truth thou hast said that he is one and there is none other save he.' The great fact was that of God's unity; and the passage in Mk 12 reinforces both what the Scribes had reasoned in their hearts, and the solemn words of the Master to the would-be seeker after eternal life.

In pleading, however, that 'except the one God' may be the possibly right translation of εἰ μη εἷς Θεός, it is worth noting in support of this that the 'Newcastle Bible,' published in 1811, with a text based on that of the London Polyglot, reads the Arabic *al-Wahid* after Allah both in Mk 2^{7} and Mk 10^{18}. Over a century previously for Maronite Christians a copy of the New Testament was produced in Rome in Arabic and Syriac in parallel columns and here again in both contexts the same translation (possibly direct from Syriac) is to be noted. 'Who can forgive sins, except the one God?' 'There is none good, except the one God.' Though one of these books is the work of Roman Catholic and the other of Protestant scholarship, it is probable that the text of the Gospels goes back to older documents. The 'Newcastle Bible' would be ultimately derived from the Paris Polyglot, when Syriac was printed for the first time; and the Arabic-Syriac N.T. to a text published in Rome in 1591.[4]

Possibly it may be legitimate to go farther back still and suggest that in the original reaction of the Scribes and Pharisees in Capernaum, they murmured no more than 'Who can forgive sins but the One'? and that ὁ Θεός was just another of those Markan comments, which we have come to know from Turner and others, that the Evangelist made for the sake of clarity where his Roman readers were concerned. Similarly what our Lord said to the questioner was, 'There is none good save the one.' Does not this bring the statement into line with the Matthean variation, 'The one is good'? The form of the statement with Θεός omitted is just as Semitic as with its insertion. That there is no textual evidence for the suggestion that ὁ Θεός is a Markan note interpreting εἷς [just as ὁ πατήρ is placed after ἀββά for Roman readers][1] must be admitted, but not without reference being made to the Origenic quotations of Mk 10^{18} and the reading of *Pater* in Lk 18^{19} in the Latin of the Codex Bezae. But it is certainly worth noting that this suggestion is borne out by the Arabic version of Tatian's Diatessaron, which in Mk 10^{18} reads 'al-Wahid Allah.'[2] This is a most unusual construction in Arabic, where the adjective normally follows the noun; so that in this sentence grammatically the word 'al-Wahid' (the one) comes to be an adjective used as a noun, and the following Allah is another noun used in explanation. Is there not support here for our suggestion? There is the other passage in Mark, where our Lord quotes Deuteronomy to 'one of the scribes,' and in answer to the well-known statement that 'The Lord our God, the Lord is one,' the scribe replies, 'Thou hast well said that he is one; and *there is none other but he*.'[3] This form of statement corresponds closely to the creed of Islam; particularly in its possibly original form, 'There is none but he.' Time and again we meet with this phrase in the Qur'an.[4] This is just another instance of the passing on to Islam of the passionate devotion to the divine unity that characterized the Jews of Arabia, who seem to have shared in the national propensity for not mentioning unnecessarily the name of God, and whose monotheism stood out against the background of Arabian polytheism in a way that influenced the young Muhammad very deeply. Islam ever since his day has claimed to hold the doctrine of the divine unity in its purest form. This of course is really very questionable as life for the Muslim has worked out; but the verbal simplicity of the Muslim Creed still remains—the combination of the great negation 'There is no deity,' with the greater affirmation 'except Allah.' But the pioneering was not Islam's, for Judaism had already passed on the glowing and the growing conviction to the first Christians. So St. Paul to the Galatians with his 'A mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one,'[5] or, St. James to the Dispersion with his 'Thou believest that God is one; the demons also believe and shudder'—an inheritance this not from the Nazareth home but from a common Semitic background that yet lies behind the near east and what the near east has given to the west.[6] There are other instances too in the New Testament,[7] but with this inheritance it is surely warrantable to seek to find expression of the great conviction not only in the Epistles but in the Gospels—more especially the earliest. Some of the MSS. and versions have been doing their best to keep this common article of belief to the fore in the conversations of the Christ. It probably would not come amiss if in all our Christian relationship with Islam and Judaism to-day we retained the crystal-clear insistence, characteristic of the New Testament on the Christian belief in 'The one God,' not forgetting the gloss of Origen and the Codex Bezae, 'Father.'

---

[1] This is of course a Christian device.

[2] 'By himself'—'only.'

[3] Cf. Jn 5^{18}; Ph. 2^{6}.

[4] *Catalogue of Printed Bibles*, II., 20 f., 63, 68. Luther also followed this rendering in Mk 10^{18}; Mt 19^{17}; Lk 18^{19}, but regarded it as a variant in Mk 2^{7}.

---

[1] Mk 14^{36}.

[2] Ciasca's Edition, 50, 109.

[3] Mk $12^{29.32}$.

[4] *e.g.* Sura 2^{253}.

[5] Gal 3^{20}.

[6] Ja 2^{19}, cf. Qur'an suras 46^{28} and $72^{1f.}$

[7] Eph 4^{6}; 1 Ti 2^{5}.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

How we got our English New Testament.

By Reverend John O. Barrett, M.A.,
Newcastle-on-Tyne.

'Search the scriptures.'—Jn 5^{39}.

About four hundred years ago there lived in one of the lovely Cotswold villages of Gloucestershire a young man whose name was William Tyndale. He was private tutor to the little sons of Sir John Walsh, a country gentleman. Sometimes he preached too, for he was also a clergyman. As he moved about in the county he became more and more impressed and saddened by the ignorance of the clergymen. Some of them did not even know who was the author of the Lord's Prayer. It was no wonder that religion was in a bad way, and that the fact that Jesus had come to be the Saviour of the world seemed to make little or no difference to men's lives. The real root of the trouble was that very few people knew anything about the New

Testament, for there was no copy of it in English which they could read. Young William Tyndale, who had studied at the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and was a very good scholar, made up his mind that he would bring the New Testament to his countrymen by translating it into English. One day he was talking over the matter with a learned man, who said it was more important to have the Pope's law than God's law. This was part of Tyndale's reply to him: 'If God spare my life, ere many years I will cause the boy that driveth the plough shall know more of the Scripture than thou dost.' But he had set himself a difficult and indeed a dangerous task, for there was a law to the effect that nobody must translate the Scriptures on his own authority. Tyndale must therefore find some powerful friend who would help him. He decided to go to the new Bishop of London, for what he had heard of him made him think he would be friendly. But Bishop Tunstall gave no encouragement to Tyndale, perhaps because he was afraid of becoming too closely connected with a new movement which was unpopular in some quarters. Tyndale, however, found one good friend in London, a cloth merchant named Humphrey Monmouth, who took him into his home for six months, and then helped him to go to Germany, where he would be safer, have greater freedom to do his translating, and where printing was more advanced than in England. At last Tyndale finished his translation of the New Testament into English and got it printed. Copies of it were brought to England secretly. Some of them were seized and burned, but soon English people got to know about the book, and more and more copies of it found their way into English homes, and were eagerly read.

William Tyndale continued to live abroad for the most part, for safety's sake, for he had many enemies. He spent his time translating parts of the Old Testament, and in revising his New Testament, most of which is still part of our New Testament to-day, so finely did Tyndale do his work. But his enemies pursued him abroad, and at last he was betrayed and imprisoned, and finally condemned to die as a heretic. Such was the sincerity and goodness of his life that, during his imprisonment of a year and a half, his keeper, the keeper's daughter, and others of his household became convinced Christians. During that time his love of the Bible was as strong as ever. In one of his letters he asked to be allowed to have a lamp in the evening, and 'the Hebrew Bible, Hebrew dictionary, and Hebrew grammar, that I may pass the time in that study.' When William Tyndale was taken out to die he must have been still longing that the people of England might have the Bible in their own tongue, for his last recorded words were the prayer: 'Lord, open the King of England's eyes.' We can rejoice that his prayer was answered, for within two years King Henry the Eighth had ordered through his minister, Thomas Cromwell, that a large copy of the Bible in English was to be placed in every parish church in England. This was in 1538, just four hundred years ago, and wherever the event is celebrated, as it will be all over England this year, the name of heroic William Tyndale will be remembered with gratitude.

Heat, Light, and Sound.

By the Reverend F. G. Hastings, B.A., Derby.

'I am the light of the world.'—Jn 8[12].

I want to tell you an interesting thing that I saw in a sick-room recently. Beside the fireplace there was an electric socket, in which was placed the usual electric plug. The strange thing was, that instead of the usual one coiled wire coming from it, there were three. Three coiled wires from one plug! The first, a rather stout wire, ran to the electric radiator, which was on, and which gave out a delightful warmth. The second, a thinner wire this time, ran to a small table-lamp, which sent forth a comfortably shaded light. The third wire ran to the wireless set, and this was turned on to give us the Children's Hour. So, you see, we had in that room, at one and the same time, heat, light, and sound, and the unique thing is—they all came from the one source, from the one electric plug!

Now, as you all know, heat, light, and sound are three of the most important things in the world. We just could not live without them. But they are very important, too, in another way. They are important for joy and happiness. Sometimes you say that a person is warm-hearted, by which you mean that she is kind, and loving, and friendly. People who are cold, who are shrivelled and miserable, can make life very unhappy. So we must have warmth. And we must have light, too. You may not like dictation, and spelling, and arithmetic, but you would know very little without them. Your mind would be very dark, and you would not be able to make your way very far in life. And more still, if you did not know what was right, and good, and true, you would be in a yet sadder plight. People would not trust you, because you did wrong things. And we must also have sound as well. It is no use having warm, kind feelings if you cannot tell them to others; it is no use knowing what is good if you cannot speak it forth.

Now, the wonderful thing is this—you and I can get all these things from one source by connecting our lives with one Person. And that Person is Jesus.

Do you know why Jesus came to this earth? Well, the answer is that God sent Him because 'He so *loved* the world.' He came to bring us the warmth of God's friendliness. And do you know that Jesus once said, 'I am the *light* of the world'? He was a wonderful Teacher, and if you walk in the light of His teaching you will never miss your way in life. And do you know that when Jesus' disciples were bothered as to what they should *say* about Him to others, He told them not to worry, but He would tell them the words that they should speak?

So, you see, the one electric plug that conveyed the heat, and the light, and the sound, teaches me, and I hope teaches you too, that the loving warmth of our heart, and the light of our mind, and the words of our mouth, we may all receive from our one Lord, whose name is Jesus Christ.

The Christian Year.

Fourth Sunday after Easter.

Thought and Conduct: A Sermon for the Young.

> 'The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall guard your hearts and your thoughts in Christ Jesus. . . . Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honourable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely . . . think on these things.'—Ph 4[7. 8] (R.V.).

It would require a bold man to undertake the oversight of an intricate and delicate piece of machinery without some knowledge of the forces with which he had to work. For if he did accept the risk, at any moment his ignorance of the action of steam or of electricity might bring upon him a disaster of the first magnitude.

Every day of our lives we have to administer a piece of mechanism far more delicate and more intricate than that of the engineer—that wonderful piece of mechanism, composed of thought and feeling and will, that we call our mind.

It does not matter what the action may be—good or bad, easy or difficult—we always reach it by the same three steps. First, there is the simple idea of the action in our mind; next, the feeling of pleasure it inspires changes the mere idea of it into a desire for it; then the desire for it has to fight against rival desires, until, having finally proved itself the strongest, it gives its orders to our will, and the will records the necessary resolve.

At the moment in which we have to choose between rival lines of conduct our actual choice is directed by our strongest desire. One man decides to steal, because his desire for the object to be stolen is stronger than his desire to be honest; another man decides to resist the temptation to theft, because his desire to be honest is stronger than his desire to increase his possessions. The key to right action is to learn in every choice of our life to make the right desire the strongest one. That brings us to the very centre of the problem of conduct. How do we make one desire in our life stronger than another? The answer is, we do so by means of our thoughts. If we call to mind anything that we particularly desire we see at once that it is something to the attractiveness of which we have often directed our thoughts. As we all know, the man who has a strong desire to excel as a sportsman is the man who has thought a great deal about the attractions of sport. Within the various subdivisions of sport, the man who is eager to be a fine cricketer is the man who has thought a great deal about the attractions of cricket.

A man with an ambition to be an engineer is one who has repeatedly thought about motors and machinery; a man who has a strong desire to be a politician or a missionary is one who has given protracted thought to these careers; a man who is powerfully allured by certain sins is one who has dwelt much upon them in his thoughts. The fact is that the longer and more often we think about the attractiveness of any course of conduct whatever, the more commanding position we give to it in our own desires. Plainly, therefore, it is in our own power to make any desire we please the strongest desire for our mind by allowing our thoughts to dwell long enough and often enough upon its advantages.[1]

In our text a guardianship of thought is promised to us. It is very suggestive that the root of this word translated 'peace' has the significance of 'to join.' A joining has taken place, an adjustment between the soul and God. Conscious friendship with Him is indispensable to peace of heart. And then it is peace within ourselves, the harmonizing of our impulses. Love is the only worthy power to which thought really yields control, and if God's love is continually shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit, then we shall know something of a controlled and purified thought-life.

[1] H. Bisseker, *The Way of Discipleship*, 104.

This does not mean that we shall be delivered from the necessity of conflict. But stronger than all assaulting evil is the promised guardianship. The figure is that of a siege. The life is surrounded by subtle foes seeking to gain an entrance. Unworthy, unholy, defiling thoughts are at the gates, cunningly seeking to gain an entrance. But within, peace stands as sleepless sentinel and guard. We may personalize the phrase, for Christ is Himself the peace of God, and the promised protection is 'in Christ Jesus.' We are under Christ's guardianship. He stands as sentinel at the door of the citadel of the heart.

Assuming that we have yielded ourselves to the Lord, and are now relying upon His promise to undertake the responsibility of guarding our hearts and our thoughts, we are enjoined to think on 'whatsoever things are true, honest, lovely, and of good report.' Christ does not supersede our own activities, but rather strengthens them, and to us is committed the task of crowding out the evil by the good, always in reliance upon His imparted strength.[1]

It does not follow that when we first face any particular choice our desire for the right course of action is the stronger. We may as yet be far more powerfully attracted by the thought of the wrong action. Even then it is in our power to make what is at first the weaker desire the stronger one. All that we need to do is to turn our thoughts resolutely away from the attractiveness of the evil course and to centre them resolutely upon the attractiveness of the better one—to let our mind dwell steadily and immovably upon the reasons for being truthful or honourable or pure or unselfish, as the case may be. The longer and the more intensely we do that, the weaker the evil desire will become and the more powerful will grow the better desire, until, in the end, the better desire will be found to have become the stronger of the two and so the right decision be assured. All this is possible to us in every temptation of our life. The key to victory lies in the management of our thoughts.

Dr. G. Steven tells that in his boyhood he was taken to see a famous quarry. Over what appeared to him a great gulf there had been made a pathway one plank broad for wheel-barrows, and over that perilous path quarrymen were wheeling loads of earth. He asked how the thing was possible, and a quarryman explained that he was able to wheel the barrow without stumbling by fixing his eye on the farther goal. He did not ignore the gulf and the danger; certainly did not deny their existence; he was aware of them. It was because of their presence that he kept his eye fixed on the goal. But it was his concentrated attention on that that kept him safe.

But we need not wait until the moment of choice is upon us. All our life we are building up our desires by means of our thoughts. The degree of strength with which our better and our worse desires will go into action at any moment of temptation is being determined for us beforehand—by the thoughts we now are cherishing at every moment. If day after day our thoughts are pure and courageous and unselfish, our better desires are continually gaining a new strength: if, on the other hand, our daily thoughts are gross and cowardly and self-seeking, a more powerful hold upon us is continually being granted to our evil desires. Therefore, above all things else in life let us guard our secret thoughts. It is not easy. This is a battle that all men have to fight. There is something in our nature that incites us—as it seems, without encouragement—to thoughts that are selfish and untrue and unworthy of our manhood.

But allow no compromise here. Be absolutely firm in resisting evil thoughts, and cherish only thoughts that are true and uplifting. The thoughts that we cherish will decide the entire issue of our life. It is at this point that we are fighting the critical battle of our existence. Therefore, 'whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honourable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely . . . *think* on *these* things.'

Fifth Sunday after Easter.

Work.

'Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work.'—Ex 20[9].

'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.' But, also, 'six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work.' That is not the emphasis of the commandment, no doubt; but there is a kind of assumption in it. In old days the Sabbath-breaker was dealt with—faithfully. But the casual gentleman, who forgot that six-sevenths of the week was meant for work, the good-naturedly lazy, the dilettante, and the ineffective half-doer have scarcely come to their own in the matter of ecclesiastical rebuke.

Now, in that estimate of ethical proportion we have not caught the Spirit of Jesus. He somewhat shocked the more rigid of His own day. He *helped* people on the Sabbath. It was one of the reasons why they killed Him. On the other hand, not the most rigid of them could suggest a suspicion against Him, that He failed to keep the command that there are six days in which we ought to work. How He worked! There were occasions when He had not time even for His meals. Therein, he was only in accord with the great Spirit, whom He revealed to us. 'My Father worketh hitherto and I work.' How ceaselessly, how restlessly, God works in Nature. Every spring, every summer, speak to us of the constantly exerted energy of God. Whatever else we may say about earth, it is the sphere of a constant labour.

---

[1] G. S. Johnson, *Digging the Old Wells*, 63.

We may, therefore, conclude from the example of Jesus and from the example of Nature, which both reveal the will of God, that God intends us to appreciate that this is a command, laid upon our consciences, that, up to the limit of our power, we shall labour and do all our work. God wants us to *do* things. To that will of His, He would have a willing assent. From us He wants a love of work and a power of work. Even when it is irksome, He would have from us a recognition that it is good, and an intention and a zeal to perform it.

Ruskin, in the *Crown of Wild Olive*, tells that mankind may be divided into two main sections—those who work by preference and those who play by preference; and that the distinction between these two sets depends, not so much on the things that they do, as upon the spirit in which they do them. There is implied in the conception of work, the selection of an end towards which we endeavour.

And we find ourselves faced with the fact that there is an end, in this life, which we select—our profession; and there is an end, beyond this life, imposed upon us—character. Moreover, we soon come to see that the selection of an end in life as it is, and of effort towards it, is a potent contributory means towards the achieving of the end which stretches beyond this life, the end which is given us by God, namely, the achieving of a right state of being. What is needed on our part is practical assent to this arrangement. It is an arrangement, whereby, if we are to glorify God and enjoy Him for ever, we are—unless He puts some special obstacle in our way, such as ill-health—to choose some piece of work to do in this world and to do it hard.

With due recognition of this fact, the right Christian, who purposes to achieve that state of character which glorifies God, will have certain attitudes and faculties developing within him. He will have a right scorn of idleness in all its forms. Progress depends on effort. It depends on

men who fare
Lockmouthed, a match in lungs and thews
For this fierce angel of the air
To twist with him and take his bruise.

The development of ourselves and of the race will only come in answer to strong, strenuous effortfulness.

Idleness
Is chief mistresse
Of vices all.

At any rate, it is the companion of vices all. It is the characteristic of the man who is the sport of the stimulus of the moment. It is the mother of waste—waste of faculty, waste of possibility of service. Does a man, who is frittering away his time, ever consider what the future may have in store for him? Some day, perhaps at the day of judgment, but certainly some day, he will come up against his might-have-been. A voice will say, 'I gave thee five talents; where are the five thou mightest have gained in trading?' And he will see his life as it should have been. Perhaps he might have added to human knowledge, or guided human affairs, or flashed, through the dark, arrows of lightnings. This one and that one might have arisen to call him blessed. All this he had power for, and he threw it away. What for? For a handful of gold? Oh! dear me, no! For nothing so worth while. For a morning in an easy-chair, a diligent reading of the daily paper, a little more sleep, a little more slumber, a stroll from nowhere in particular to nowhere else in particular, and utter boredom to season it withal. This he got in exchange for life and service and work with God!

There is no question that it is a right assent to work that gives a dignified meaning to life. When we choose work, and set ourselves to do it, then life becomes a great thing, provided we see our work in the light of the eternal. The Lord's Day stands at the beginning of the week: after it come the six days of labour. But over them a light is cast from the presence of God, which dominates all. 'The Lord of Love came down from above to live with the men that work.' And His presence, as a felt companionship, gives an extraordinary dignity to a life of effort. For we are fellow-workers with God. *Through* our work, certainly, in the development of character; but also *in* our work. All honest work, useful in the world for right ends, is work with God.

And yet it is hard for some to get that inspiration. 'They also serve who only stand and wait.' But if one is on a bed of pain, shut out from the world's energy, it must be hard to believe it. Or, if the work is routine—a work that in bitterness a man thinks he could get a calculating machine to do better—it must be hard to believe it. Many a man must be thankful that the spheres of voluntary service and of family life come to suggest more vividly co-operation with God. All those, to whom the thought of co-operation with God in their tasks can come easily and copiously, should be grateful men.

A great opportunity of service is the very wine of life. But, indeed, there is scarce one to whom a worthy chance of doing is not given. 'Life is but a little holding lent to a mighty labour.' Believe that. 'We are one with heaven and the stars, when life is spent to serve God's aim.' Believe that. And we shall not fail of a reward, a reward given to them that in work win honour and sweet rest. It is the reward of a quiet spirit that knows its harbourage, and of entrance into life that is life indeed.[1]

Sunday after Ascension.

Prayer.

'When ye pray.'—Mt 6^7.

There can be no doubt at all that the activity we call 'prayer' is the very heart of religion, so that it would be true to say that if we were to write a history of prayer throughout the ages we should at the same time have really written a history of religion. What marks off a religious person from every other kind of person is the fact that the religious person makes definite time in his life for prayer. And what marks off a religious gathering from every other kind of gathering is the fact that at certain moments in that gathering the leader says, 'Let us pray.'

Now, of course, there are to-day hosts of people who do not pray, or who at least do not make a regular habit of prayer. How are we going to answer the person who insists he has tried prayer and has found from practical experience that it makes no difference at all? First of all, and most important of all, we should try to make clear to him what prayer really is. And perhaps the best way to do that is to begin by making clear to him what prayer is *not*.

For one thing, prayer is not a quick and easy way of getting things for ourselves which otherwise we would not get. This idea of prayer is really quite childish, and yet numbers of apparently intelligent people seem to think that this is all we mean by prayer. Mr. H. G. Wells, in his *Autobiography*, tells how in his first book-keeping examination he could not get his accounts to balance. The time was creeping on, so he prayed furiously to God to help him. No answer came. 'All right, God,' he tells us he said to himself, 'don't catch me praying again.' Prayer is not, let it be emphasized, simply a quick and easy way of getting what otherwise we cannot get. If it were, it would be thoroughly bad for us. We should not develop at all, but remain petted, spoilt children all our days.

Are we, then, never to ask God for things at all? Is petition altogether to be cut out of our prayers? The answer would seem to be that we have a right to pray only for those things for which we can imagine Jesus, in our position, praying. That is what prayer 'in the name of Jesus' or 'through Jesus Christ our Lord' really means. It means passing all our desires through the mesh of His central purpose, for us and the world, and that purpose is our growth in Christ-likeness of character and the world's baptism into His spirit. A medical missionary, for instance, convinced that an extension of his hospital is in line with God's purpose, has a right to pray for the necessary money to be forthcoming and a right to expect an answer to his prayer. But the saintliest souls would confess, that as they get older they find themselves praying less and less for things, for material blessings, even blessings like physical health. They find themselves more and more content to leave these things in God's hands; but what they do pray is that, whatever happens to them of joy or of sorrow, of success or of failure, they may be kept humble and brave, quiet and glad, hopeful and believing.

Prayer is not just an amiable soliloquy with ourselves, a convenient and rather efficient form of mind-culture. Prayer, conceived like this, Dr. Fosdick suggests, can best be put in the form of a parable. 'Two boys were sent out into the fields to dig for hidden treasure, and all day long they worked in vain. In the evening, coming home weary and disappointed, their father met them, and comforted them by saying, "After all, you did get something; the digging itself was good exercise."'

So we come to our definition of what prayer really is. It is not a quick and easy way of getting things from God. It is not a mere form of mind-culture. It is rather that activity whereby a person who is trying to live the Christ-life seeks to open up his mind and heart to the promised help and guidance of God. It is not a matter of vehemently pleading and pleading, of entreating and entreating, as though God were unwilling to help: it is rather a matter of being still and quietly waiting and allowing Him to do for us and in us that which we need.

---

[1] J. R. P. Sclater, *The Enterprise of Life*, 208.

If this, then, be the real purpose of prayer, how should we order our own prayer life? Obviously it should be regular. 'When you cannot pray as you would, pray as you can.' And how are we going to spend our prayer time? It should begin with a quiet affirming to ourselves of all that God is, and has been, and still can be. This can be done by reading over a hymn or a psalm, by reading over some of the great promises from the Gospels and the Epistles, by reading over a prayer from some of the more recent collections like Dr. Orchard's *The Temple* or Professor John Baillie's *A Diary of Private Prayer*; and some of us seem to get more help when we do this reading aloud. Then we should be still for a moment, completely relaxed, just resting our souls in God, breathing in, as it were, the atmosphere of His presence. Then, very quietly but very confidently, we should spread out our day before Him. Finally, there should be another moment of quiet waiting, to listen for anything He has to say to us, and then perhaps the Lord's Prayer or some Doxology.

'Until we realize,' writes Evelyn Underhill, 'that it is better, more useful, to spend, let us say, the odd ten minutes in the morning in feeling and finding the Eternal than in flicking the newspaper—that this will send us off to the day's work really endowed with new power of dealing with circumstances—we have not begun to live the life of the Spirit or found the power of doing our best work, whatever it may be.' And here is Mrs. Sidney Webb's testimony: 'During the ten years intervening between my mother's death and my father's death and my own marriage, crucial years during which I acquired the art of a social investigator, experienced intense emotional strain, and persisted in continuous intellectual toil under adverse circumstances, it was the habit of prayer which enabled me to survive, and to emerge relatively sound in body and sane in mind.'

But there is prayer not only for ourselves. There is prayer for others as well, what we call 'intercession.' Does this make any difference? When we pray for a person who is ill, who is in some anguish of mind or spirit, who is being sorely tempted, do we in any way alter that person's situation? Most surely we do. But not by calling God's attention to some emergency which He has apparently overlooked, but rather by opening up another channel along which His saving help can move. 'I never visited Bishop Gore,' wrote a prominent Quaker after the Bishop's death, 'without feeling a new or closer liaison with the Eternal, a strengthening of the hands of God.' And a leading London society hostess said that she had never spent any time in the company of Alice Meynell, the poetess, without feeling afterwards that she must go away to a church and pray. Both these people, Bishop Gore and Alice Meynell, lived so close to God that they were able, by the very atmosphere they spread, to mediate His presence to others.

Now it seems that when we really pray for a person, we put round that person a kind of God-charged atmosphere, the sort of atmosphere which Bishop Gore and Alice Meynell and countless other saintly souls have carried about with them, and that atmosphere enables God to draw more near to that particular heart. We pray, for instance, for a person who is ill or battling with some fierce temptation. Were we able to be beside that person, and were we people living very close to God, we would by our very presence help that person, quieten his fears, cleanse his thoughts, lift him on to a new level of hope and confidence and purpose, cast round him an atmosphere of God. But for some reason, perhaps of distance, we cannot be beside him, so we pray for him, and by our prayers we do much the same thing. We cast round him an atmosphere which is laden with suggestions of God and His love and His peace and His purity and His complete adequacy, and through that atmosphere and in it God is enabled to speak much more distinctly.

'For many years,' writes Dr. John R. Mott, 'it has been my practice in travelling among the nations to make a study of the source of the spiritual movements which are doing most to transform individuals and communities. At times it has been difficult to discover the hidden spring, but invariably, where I have had the time and patience to do so, I have found it in an intercessory prayer-life of great reality.'

More things are wrought by prayer
Than this world dreams of. Wherefore, let thy voice
Rise like a fountain for me night and day.
For what are men better than sheep or goats
That nourish a blind life within the brain,
If, knowing God, they lift not hands of prayer
Both for themselves and those who call them friend?
For so the whole round earth is every way
Bound by gold chains about the feet of God.[1]

---

[1] G. T. Bellhouse, *Thinking It Out*, 92.

WHIT-SUNDAY.

The Spirit of the Lord.

'The Lord is the Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."—2 Co 3[17] (R.V.).

On Whit-Sunday we inevitably think of the Holy Ghost as the principle of ecclesiastical life, that power resident within the society of Christians which determines its course, explains its influence, and guarantees its permanence. Whit-Sunday, it is truly said, is the 'birthday of the Christian Church.' Go back to the very beginnings of Christianity and observe the distinctive characteristics of that Church which was then born into the world. Consider the behaviour of those disciples upon whom the Holy Spirit came, and, from the astonishing facts, see the actual influence of the new factor which had been solemnly disclosed at Pentecost.

Note first the marvellous exaltation of human nature which attested the coming of the Holy Ghost. The symbolical narrative of the sacred historian sets this fact in the forefront. Read as record of literal fact, or read more intelligently as a representation through symbols of a spiritual fact, that narrative leaves on the mind one dominating impression. These disciples, ordinary men and women, upon whom the power from on high descended, were lifted on to a higher plane, their natural faculties received unprecedented stimulus, so that they were capable of attempting and carrying through great ventures which seemed to mock their apparent weakness. 'They were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.' Now this exaltation of Nature does appear to be the consequence of a sincere acceptance of the Christian religion. Humanity in all its characteristic relationships has flowered most richly within Christendom.

Note next the sudden release from old prejudices which follows the coming of the Holy Ghost. Pentecost witnessed a real enfranchisement of the human spirit. Suddenly, as that mysterious inspiration came upon them, the disciples found themselves able to understand others, and to make themselves intelligible. Instead of seeing other men at a distance, and regarding them through the coloured and distorted medium of inherited prejudice, they saw them close at hand, and recognized them as verily one with themselves. This was the most amazing circumstance of Pentecost, and this marvel has never ceased in the world. The foes of Christianity attest it as confidently as the friends. There is nothing really parallel to the versatility of the Christian religion, its power to enter into the most various circumstances, and to make itself intelligible to the most diverse types of humanity. It has demonstrated its power to make the most of human nature, and to bring together into harmony the most widely severed sections of the human family. In the common service of the 'One Lord' there is found a unifying factor which is strong enough to obliterate the prejudices born of natural diversity and of historical estrangements. 'As many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ. There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female: for ye all are one man in Christ Jesus.'

Note, thirdly, the amazing courage which burned in these disciples on whom the Holy Ghost came down. A handful of Galilean peasants and fishermen, proscribed by the authorities of Church and State, deprived as it were but yesterday of their leader and that by the most humiliating and miserable of tragedies, are seen to address themselves with boldness and vigour to no less a task than that of the world's conquest. The full measure of their audacity is concealed from us, who live in a world that from time immemorial has honoured the name of Christ: but to the men who witnessed the birth of the Christian Church this audacity of the disciples appeared in its full significance.

When we ask what was the explanation of that courage of the first believers, we find that it was their twofold creed. They believed that God was with them; and they believed also that God was within them. The first belief set them free from the fear which the vast forces ranged against them might naturally have aroused; the second belief gave them a firm conviction of truth, and made them strong to profess it against the most formidable odds. Christianity effected the release of the individual conscience; it was the new birth of human self-respect. The first consequence of Pentecost was the solemn assertion of the rights of the individual conscience. Standing before the Sanhedrin, the two leaders of the Christian company, plain unlettered men, but full of the Holy Ghost, made a protest which marks an epoch in the advance of mankind. 'Peter and John answered and said unto them, Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you rather than unto God, judge ye: for we cannot but speak the things which we saw and heard. . . . We must obey God rather than men.' It is the old great affirmation of the Hebrew prophets remade with new and more august sanctions. 'He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good.' In the last resort, we have an oracle within, which we cannot mistake, which we must obey. Churches may err, have erred, will err: but their error cannot remove the candlestick from the shrine of the believer's heart. 'The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord,' a candle which is kindled at the very central flame of Godhead.

Note, yet once more, the large-minded wisdom with which the first Christians faced the new problems, which crowded upon them for solution as soon as the gospel had to be domesticated in the world. Pentecost enfranchised the human understanding. The Apostolic writings remain after nineteen centuries the grand securities of the Church against the besetting sins of all human institutions—fossilization, narrowness, inability to absorb the lessons of experience, and to move forward. 'Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.' The history of the Apostolic Age is a luminous commentary on these words. We speak now of the trials of transition, and it is, of course, the case that every age is properly transitional. Society is in perpetual flux: nothing remains quite the same at eventide as it was at sunrise. But it is also the case that the rapidity of change differs greatly from age to age, and the Apostolic Age was an age of great and rapid change. The converts of the Apostles would have to witness revolutionary changes. It is truly astonishing that the Christian Church should have emerged from its first age without any rigid system bound to become in course of time a source of embarrassment and weakness. The New Testament is not a code of law, or a treatise of formal theology, or a register of binding precedents, but a collection of occasional writings attached to the biographies of the Founder, and the history of the founding of the Church. We have there the life and witness of the Saviour, and the revelation of the Spirit interpreting Him to the Church. We have a disclosure of first principles, and illustrations of their application to human life: and there the direct contribution of the Apostles to the guidance of the Church appears to cease. For the rest, Christians are bidden to follow the leading of the Holy Ghost, and to be sure that that guidance will not fail them. Freedom is the very note of discipleship; but it is a freedom, not of anarchy, but of inward law.

Note, finally, that the Spirit revealed His presence by enabling men to reach a higher level of morality. The self was released from the burden of sin; and quickened by a Divine energy of righteousness. The fruits of the Spirit are not gifts of tongues, prophesying, working of miracles, and such like, which appear to have been widely distributed among the first converts of the Apostles, but moral qualities which fall within our own common experience. What is distinctly and emphatically claimed is that every Christian must needs possess the Holy Spirit, and must needs prove the fact by a higher morality than would be otherwise possible.

Mr. Warde Fowler, one of the most eminent modern students of the ancient world, writes: 'The plant [of Christianity] though grown in soil which had borne other crops, was wholly new in structure and vital principle. I say this deliberately, after spending so many years on the study of the religion of the Romans, and making myself acquainted in some measure with the religions of other peoples. The essential difference, as it appears to me, is this, that whereas the connexion between religion and morality had so far been a loose one—at Rome, indeed, so loose, that many have refused to believe in its existence—the *new religion was itself morality*, but morality consecrated and raised to a higher power than it had ever yet reached.'

Exaltation of human nature, enfranchisement from prejudice and whatsoever estranges men from one another, courage to attempt great ventures, wisdom to solve new problems, above all, a higher level of life—these are the 'notes' of the true Church.

Come, Holy Ghost, our souls inspire
And lighten with celestial fire.

Be that our prayer and invocation to-day on the nation, and on the Church, in our homes and in our hearts, 'for where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.'[1]

Trinity Sunday.

Holiness.

'They rest not day and night.'—Rev 4[8].

Probably there is no subject in the whole range of religious thought in which it is so necessary for us to be continually correcting the symbolism of sentiment and imagination by the sober and realistic interpretations of reason as in the subject of heaven.

We are too fond of thinking of the after-life as a life of everlasting rest and a life of endless adoration and praise. 'There remaineth therefore a rest unto the people of God,' says the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews; and among all the splendid visions of the Book of Revelation, the vision that clings is the picture of the great multitude whom no man can number with golden harps, forever chanting *Holy, holy, holy,* round the Throne.

---

[1] H. H. Henson, *The Creed in the Pulpit*, 237.

But we must here reflect how, through all the Scripture, inspired insight has been compelled to speak of heaven in the language of paradox and contradiction. Heaven, we are often told, is a place where sorrow and sighing are done away; yet we are also reminded that

> There is no place where earth's sorrows
> Are more felt than up in heaven.

It is a place where God the Father sits on His throne of glory,

> By prostrate spirits day and night
> Incessantly adored.

And yet the great deep of His Heart is filled with yearning for His prodigal children—nay, He is still on the earth seeking for them with tears of anguish. It is the place where Christ is exalted to the right hand of God, with power; and yet He is still the Lamb slain—He still makes broken-hearted intercession before the throne. It is a place where there is no night and no temple; and yet there, also, men are to serve Him day and night in His temple. It is a place where the redeemed rest from their labours; yet they rest not day nor night; but His servants serve Him; and some of them, martyr-souls, are still crying out in pain, 'How long, O Lord, how long?'

It is time that religious men and women were getting over the shyness of other-worldliness that had fallen on our modern day. The very mark of a Christian, according to the Evangelist John, is that 'he knows whither he is going.' For when heaven is rightly conceived, 'there is nothing,' it has been finely said, 'so morally transforming as the practice of our own presence in glory.' Heaven is just the continuation, the expansion and transfiguration of this our earthly life.

Let us pursue the thought for a little way. There are two characteristics of heaven which God, through Christ, has made us sure of; there is no sin, and there is no death, in heaven. Consider how these two things relate themselves to human life. What is all our earthly morality but just a striving towards the shining ideal of perfect goodness? And what is the twin sister of moral endeavour in this scene of time? Is it not the yearning for more life and fuller? And it is just this that our religion brings to us. When the love of God, through Christ, redeems us, what is the great peace which falls upon the soul but just the dawning of heaven's purity, the beginning of the end of sin—yea, and the beginning of eternal life, Christ within, the hope of glory? Surely it is not immoral that we should seek to do our duties here in the light of our eternal destiny.

Yet another inference may be drawn from the thought that heaven lies very near to earth. Not only is the prospect of some great task for God hereafter of the highest value as an inspiration for all our earthly striving, but if heaven lies just beyond the veil of sense, if we are surrounded now by a great cloud of witnesses—for we may use that phrase of the unseen as well as of the past—ought it not to be of the greatest help to us in all our striving to become truer men and women, to remember that the dear and holy dead are near?

The noblest picture that was ever conceived by prophetic pen of God's concern in human history is the picture of the suffering Servant of Jehovah. And the only perfect instance of such Divine activity among men was in the lowly life of self-forgetting love that passed from Bethlehem to Calvary. It is enough for the servant that he be as his Lord. It cannot be that the saints in heaven dwell in everlasting, calm repose. 'His servants shall serve him' there; and the great ones in the kingdom of heaven are those who fulfil the hard and lowly duties.

What then of the inspired picture which makes heaven a place of eternal rest and endless worship? If we understood them aright, work and worship would be seen to be so closely related as to be, not two things, but one. It is so on the earthly scale. Even those human enterprises and activities which seem to us to be entirely earthly, are all of them built upon a stupendous act of faith. Every factory is, in the last resort, a believing prayer—of trust and confidence in the unfailing constancy of the great laws of Nature, those impulses of the Divine Will by which our world is maintained in being.

When in public or in private we bow to render unto God the homage of adoring hearts, we are simply seeking to set our human wills in line with the higher spiritual laws of that same Divine Will. Here on earth we cry, out of our brokenness and sinfulness, the prayer once taught us by lips Divine, 'Hallowed be thy name, thy will be done on earth'; and whenever in God's Word the veil of heaven is drawn aside for us, we listen to the souls of the redeemed breathing the same prayer, only transfigured and perfected, 'Holy, holy, holy be Thy Name.' The souls of the redeemed in heaven rest not day nor night as they go streaming along the outpoured impulses of the Divine Will, carrying out His high commands.

But has our Divine Master given us no glimpses of the soul's work in heaven? He once said that the saints of the Resurrection should be as the angels in heaven. And once, with tenderest hand, He lifted a fold of the veil, and showed us the angels rejoicing over earth's penitent sinners turning back to God, rejoicing as did the sons of God when the world was made.

An intolerable anguish once gripped the heart of Him who came to seek and to save the lost, when He saw the swiftly ripening human harvest, and Himself the solitary reaper clothed in the limitations and frailties of flesh and blood. Can He have forgotten His passion for souls, now that the resources of heaven are at His command, and the spirits are His messengers? The ladder of the dream of Bethel has never been withdrawn.

'Can there be work for all in heaven?' we ask; 'variety of work suited to the capacity of each?' We listen to the astronomer telling us of the sights he sees through his telescope—those nebular masses slowly being moulded into new constellations, new worlds. Perhaps the conception of some modern thinkers is true; these processes are being guided by hosts of heavenly spirits. Who would not long to serve God in those stupendous and unending tasks of His? Our own old world is still travailing in creation-throes; and whenever men have tried to explain how it can be that evolution should always be an upward movement, they have stammered and stumbled into the language of religion. *Must* they be utterly wrong? Why should not God's messengers be the hosts of souls who have emerged into the larger life and liberty of the Hereafter—helpers in the birth-pangs and growth-pains of Creation? So long as earth with its travail, and the human race with its sighing and struggling, exist, so long will there be sorrow and compassion and outgoing influences of helpfulness in heaven. Nay, if the deepest reality of heaven is the spirit of pure, self-forgetting sacrifice, will anguish ever be driven from the courts of heaven so long as anywhere there are souls in agony? How, if the Cross should prove to be the symbol and type of all heaven's activity? And the delight and joy of all the heavenly inmates should be to give themselves for others? And—heavenly mystery!—joy at last be one with sacrifice?

Our life here is our probation for our heavenly service. To long for heaven is not selfish; it is to long to join the company of God's celestial workers. But we fear we may never be worthy to become helpers of God. Jesus has not left us without some insight on that question too. It is not brilliance, not genius or learning, not social or material power and influence on earth that determine our place in the councils and activities of heaven; but only faithfulness. Not that our heavenly task is to be the same task, but something kindred and on the scale of the enlarged freedom of the life hereafter.

It is God who assigns us our places. It is the voice of the Lord of life that will greet us, when death has shut the door of our earthly finitude behind us: 'Well done, good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a few things; be thou ruler over many things. Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.' Our assurance as to our heavenly work lies in that clearest word about the after-life that ever fell from the lips of the Heavenly Builder.[1]

---

[1] J. A. Robertson, *Concerning the Soul*, 167.

◆

Professor Barth's Dogmatics.

By the Reverend Sydney Cave, M.A., D.D., Principal of New College, London.

It is now more than ten years since the publication of the first edition of Barth's *The Doctrine of the Word of God*, which was intended to provide the Prolegomena to what Barth then called *Christian Dogmatics*. In 1932 he issued the first part of the second edition of this book, changing the name of the work he planned into *Ecclesiastical Dogmatics*. That second edition was written on an immensely bigger scale, so that more than five hundred pages were required to deal with material covered in the first two hundred pages of his first edition. In the preface to this second edition Barth spoke of writing the concluding part of this revised edition at about the same length. That second part has just appeared.

But it is not five hundred pages but a thousand, and many of its big pages are printed in minute type.[1]

The first half of this second edition is now open to all English readers in the admirable translation of Professor G. T. Thomson. (How admirable is that translation is realized best by those who have read the difficult original !) It must be long before an English translation is available of this second part, and it may therefore be useful to give a brief account of the impressions received from a preliminary reading of this immense tome.

We were among the many who read the 1927 edition of *The Doctrine of the Word of God* with disappointment. Perverse as was much that Barth wrote in his *Romans*, and violent and truculent as were its paradoxes, we had found that early book of his one of the most deeply moving books that we had ever read. There Barth wrote as prophet and as preacher, denouncing the modern trivialization of Christianity, and summoning us once more to tremble before the awful reality of God. A prophet may combat one extreme by asserting another, but from a theologian more careful expression can justly be demanded. And, although in this first edition Barth quoted at great length from Protestant Schoolmen, his book showed that he had not as yet that knowledge of the whole development of Christian theology without which no theologian, however brilliant and masterful, is equipped for his task. Barth came to realize the need of 'more extensive soundings and broader foundations,' and his second edition of the first part of his *Doctrine of the Word of God* was marked not only by greater technical competency but by more careful statement. No longer, for instance, did he speak as if God's revelation was merely objective. Instead he admitted that 'in faith men have real experience of the Word of God and no *finitum non capax infiniti*, and no *peccator non capax verbi divini* should now hinder us from taking this statement seriously with all its consequences.'

In this second part, now before us, not only does Barth write with a learning it would be impertinent to praise, but he once more abandons some of his less defensible positions. Thus he admits that in his *Romans*, through his eagerness to combat *Historismus* and *Psychologismus*, he failed adequately to recognize the truth of Jn 1[14]: 'the Word became flesh and dwelt among us and we beheld his glory . . . full of grace and truth.' That is a very welcome admission, for in his earlier writings Barth went so far in his reaction from the 'Jesus of history' school as to seem to evacuate of meaning God's revelation of Himself in Jesus Christ. In the first edition of this book, Barth spoke as if baptism was the one ground for the believer's trust in the reality of his faith. This, as some of us pointed out, was a strange statement for a Protestant theologian. As Heim said, this answer was quite contrary to the Reformed position, and was 'almost Roman in its sacramentalism' (*Glaube und Denken*, 419). Barth claims that his words were in part misunderstood, but he admits that for this misunderstanding he was responsible. The most conspicuous change in Barth's presentation of theology is the fullness and the freedom with which he now speaks of the love of God to man in Christ and of man's love to God which God's love evokes. Barth's theology is thus now less distinctive because it is more truly Christian.

The volume before us has to be judged not as an independent work but as the completion of the first half of the revised edition of *The Doctrine of the Word of God*. That first half had as its first 'Chapter' Barth's treatise on 'The Word of God as the Criterion of Dogmatics.' Of the second 'Chapter,' 'The Revelation of God,' it contained only the first section, Barth's elaborate statement of the doctrine of 'The Triune God.' This new volume opens with the second and third sections of this second chapter, 'The Incarnation of the Word' and 'The Outpouring of the Spirit.' The third 'Chapter' deals with 'The Holy Scripture'; the fourth with 'The Proclamation of the Church.'

The section on 'The Incarnation of the Word' begins with the exposition of God's Freedom for men. 'The Incarnation of the eternal Word, Jesus Christ, is God's revelation. In the reality of this event, God shows His freedom to be our God.' 'That God is not hindered either through His own Godhead or through our humanity and sinfulness, from being our God and having to do with us as with His own; that He moreover is free for us and in us—that is the central content of the doctrine of Christ and of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Christology and Pneumatology are at one in this, that they are the knowledge and the praise of the Grace of God.'

In his treatise on Christology, Barth vigorously rejects any attempt to explain how Christ is truly God and truly man. This much alone we can understand: that this 'Inconceivable must be the event by which God's revelation is possible.' 'God's

---

[1] *Die kirchliche Dogmatik*, I. ii. *Die Lehre vom Wort Gottes. Prolegomena zur kirchlichen Dogmatik* (Verlag von evangelischen Buchhandlung, Zollikon; Swiss Francs 36 [about £1, 12s.]).

Word a man, a man the Word of God—that is the objective possibility of revelation.' 'If God's revelation be the way from the veiling to the unveiling of the eternal Word, from manger and cross to resurrection and ascension—then how could it be other than this "becoming man," "becoming flesh" of God?'

Barth proceeds to discuss the Time of Revelation. 'God's revelation in the event of the presence of Jesus Christ is God's time for us. It is the fulfilled time in this event. It is as the Old Testament time of expectation and as the New Testament time of remembering also the time of the witness of this event.'

Barth vigorously defends the ancient Christology of the Church from the charge of intellectualism, and emphasizes once more that Christology has to do with the revelation of God as a mystery. 'It must first know this mystery as such, and secondly recognize it as such.' This mystery the ancient Christology saw and sought to defend; and that is why fundamentally we must be on its side. Barth proceeds to describe at length—though not to explain—the mystery of the true God and true man. In this connexion he has a long and notable attack on what he calls Mariolatry.

Of special interest is the last part of this section, 'The Mystery of Christmas Eve'—the miracle that Jesus Christ 'was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.' Barth admits that the mere fact that this statement is a dogma does not compel assent. 'In dogma as such we hear only the voice of the Church, it is not revelation itself.' He admits, too, that it is 'unfair and fanatical' to say, as Bartmann has done, that 'the one and only ground for the denial' of this doctrine is 'the rationalistic dogma of the impossibility of miracle.' He admits, too, how precarious is the support in Scripture. It is the dogmatic significance of the Virgin Birth that Barth explores and emphasizes. He claims that the Church knew well what it was doing when it put this dogma as a guard, as it were, before the door of the mystery of Christmas Eve. If any one goes some other way it is at his own risk and peril. He ought to reckon his private way as a private way, and, if the preacher cannot accept the Church's dogma here, he ought at least to keep silent about it. For Barth, the Virgin Birth has great significance as the sign of the *mystery* of revelation. It is a reminder that 'God stands at the beginning where true revelation happens—God and not the arbitrary cleverness, skill, or piety of a man. The fact that God in Jesus Christ comes forth from the deep hiddenness of His Godhead to be our God among us and to act upon us, is not only actual and visible in the sign of the resurrection from the dead, it is also indicated in the Virgin Birth.' Barth fiercely—too fiercely—attacks Brunner for speaking of the Virgin Birth as 'a biological interpretation of the miracle.' Yet Barth concludes this section with the admission that we cannot say that the 'mystery of Christmas Eve stands or falls in itself ontologically with this dogma. The man Jesus of Nazareth is not the true Son of God because He was conceived of the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin, but because He is the true Son of God, who will be recognized as such, therefore was He conceived of the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin.'

The section on 'The Outpouring of the Holy Spirit' begins with the assertion of 'The Freedom of men for God.' This freedom of men to believe in God and to obey Him is always God's work and gift. 'The Holy Spirit is the subjective reality of revelation.' Barth reaffirms the *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, but admits that if by Church we meant the Church which man creates then the saying would be a 'monstrosity.' '*This* Church has nothing to do with the subjective reality of salvation.' The Church which man creates 'is not the Church but the work of sin, of the apostacy of the Church.'

'The subjective reality of revelation stands therefore in this: that we through Christ, that we in the Church, are receivers of the divine witness and, as receivers of it, are children of God. And this our existence as such is the Work of the Holy Spirit. Thus the Holy Spirit is the subjective reality of revelation.' Barth proceeds again to pass from reality to possibility. 'It is through the outpouring of the Holy Spirit that it is possible in the freedom of man, for God's revelation to come to him because to him in it God's Word is brought within his hearing.' In a long and characteristic note on this statement, Barth traces the increasing subjectivity of the Church's hymns, in which he sees the apostacy of Protestantism from the Reformation. 'The history of the Church's hymns shows an inner secularization.' He admits that '*outward* heresy is rarely to be found in modern hymnbooks' but 'the *hidden* heresy can be more or less clearly traced.' 'It is the heresy of the third article in which the Holy Spirit is regarded as different from the Spirit of Jesus Christ, professedly still the Spirit of God, a Christian Spirit, but in reality the spirit of man's inner life and earnestness, the spirit of mysticism and morality.' 'All the external secularization of Protestantism in the special form of modernist Neo-Protestantism is finally only a symptom of this inner secularization to be seen in the development of the Church's hymns.'

The second section of this chapter is entitled 'God's Revelation as the Abolition of Religion.' 'The world of human religion' is 'the sphere in which man seeks to justify and sanctify himself by means of a picture of God derived from his own thought and powers.' 'The Church is the place of true religion in so far as it lives through grace by grace.'

The following section is entitled 'Religion as Unbelief.' Barth will have nothing to do with any suggestion that Christianity is the fulfilment of human religion or that it is the true religion, superior to others. Such a statement 'does not set the truth of Christian religion in clear enough relation to the grace of revelation.' 'Religion is unbelief; it is the work of *godless* man.' This section contains some shrewd comments on paganism. 'Mysticism,' for instance, Barth describes as 'esoteric atheism.' But in no section of his book have we been more conscious of his limitations. We agree with him to the full in his assertion of the uniqueness of Christianity and its sole adequacy, but those of us who have known intimately devout Hindus and devout Jews cannot so characterize non-Christian religions. Barth shows only such knowledge of non-Christian religions as may be gained from reading the obvious German handbooks. We do not honour God by speaking as if only in the Christian sphere has He made any approach to men. All goodness is of God and, where men have sought to serve Him, their faith, even though it be directed to symbols of God unworthy of their devotion, cannot rightly be characterized as unbelief. Our Lord dealt with men in their individual circumstances. Does not God do so too? Where Zoroaster proclaimed a righteous God and Gautama spoke of pity and self-postponement, were they not so far responding to the God who has spoken to us in His Son? We cannot, indeed, speak, as many do, as if all religions taught the same truths so that it matters not whether a man be a Christian or a non-Christian if only he be faithful to the religion of his upbringing, nor may we resolve Christianity into a system of ideas. But we do not honour Christ by denying that truth and goodness are true and good wherever they be found. Faith is not unbelief even where it be faith in a God as yet not fully known.

Much more attractive is the next section on 'The Life of the Children of God.' 'The Christian life begins with love and ends, so far as human life has an end in time, with love.' Barth now writes unreservedly of the love of God and no longer calls that love 'loveless.' 'The self-giving of God in His Son is actually His love to us,' and our love is to be understood as the answer to that love of God. 'The one truly earnest praise that we can offer to God is this: to love our neighbour as ourselves.'

In his third 'Chapter,' 'The Holy Scripture,' Barth does much to make clear the relation in his thought between the Word of God and the Bible. It is as the witness to God's revelation in the Church through the Holy Spirit that the Bible is holy and God's Word. Barth frankly recognizes that the Bible must be studied historically and that its words are human words. 'The worth and authority of the Bible do not lie in the useless miracle of men's words which would be then not really human words, but in this: that we in the Bible become partakers of the real miracle, the miracle of God's grace to sinners.' On the authority of the Bible depend both the Church's authority and its freedom, authority and freedom alike being 'mediate, relative, and formal.'

The last 'Chapter' of the book deals with 'The Proclamation of the Church.' 'God's Word is God Himself in the proclamation of the Church of Jesus Christ. While God gives to the Church the task of speaking to Him, and while the Church fulfils that task, He Himself proclaims His revelation in His witnesses.' It is in this word of the Church's preacher that Barth sees the 'special and direct object of dogmatic work.' The problem of Dogmatics is '*in concreto* the work and endeavour of the Church to reach purity of teaching. Its problem is the problem of Christian teaching.'

But man does 'not merely think; he lives, acts, and suffers as he thinks.' Hence 'the ethical question—the question about right action—is the existence-question of humanity.' It is not enough to say with Althaus that 'Ethics belongs closely to Dogmatics.' Dogmatics is itself Ethics.

Dogmatics is a function both of the 'hearing' and the 'teaching' Church. 'It calls the teaching Church to a new hearing of the Word of God, the revelation to which the Bible witnesses. That it can only do as, for its part, it takes the place of the hearing Church and itself obeys the Word of God as the norm to which the hearing Church knows itself to be subordinate.' At the same time it has to take the place of the teaching Church, for the Word of God is not only the norm but the object of the Church's preaching and so Dogmatics has at once to hear and to teach.

It is impossible in one short article to give any adequate idea of this rich and suggestive book. We hope ourselves to learn more from it in future readings of it. Barth's plans, announced in the second edition of the first part, still stand. He is to write his *Dogmatik* in four volumes, dealing with The Doctrine of God, The Doctrine of Creation, The Doctrine of Reconciliation, and The Doctrine of Redemption.

We English-speaking Christians have much to learn from Barth, and many of us have tried to do so. But Barth, too, might learn something from British theology. Among Barth's innumerable quotations we have noticed only one in English, a quotation from Edward 'Irvin' [*sic*] taken from H. R. Mackintosh's great book *The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ*. Dr. Mackintosh in his *Types of Modern Theology* spoke with characteristic graciousness of Barth and expressed his high appreciation of his teaching. But Barth's own statement of Christology might have gained much from the sympathy and insight of Dr. Mackintosh's treatment. From Dr. Mackintosh's book it is possible for the student to enter into the movement of Christological thought. That a student will not learn from Barth. All tends to be black or white. There are writers of the distant past about whom he will tolerate no complaint. There are writers of the immediate past and of the present of whom he will hear no good. He still does not seem to realize that although the theologies of a Schleiermacher or a Ritschl have less to say to our age than they had to their own, yet even from them something can still be learnt; not all they wrote was wrong. And in the section on 'Religion as Unbelief' Barth might have written more wisely had he been willing to learn from writers like Drs. Farquhar and Macnicol who, holding as firmly as himself to the unique and final significance of the gospel, knew paganism too well to speak of it as if it were only sin and falsehood.

The immense scale of Barth's *Dogmatics* is a welcome sign of the seriousness with which he takes theology, but we find it hard to believe that what is only a part of a preliminary volume could not have been written with equal clarity and force in less than a thousand big and closely printed pages.

Contributions and Comments.

The Lachish Letters.

Professor Harry Torczyner, Bialik Professor of Hebrew in the University of Jerusalem, has at last favoured us with his long-promised volume on these pre-Exilic ostraca—*Lachish I.* (*Tell ed-Duweir*), *The Lachish Letters* (published for the Trustees of the late Sir Henry Wellcome by the Oxford University Press; 25s. net). The title page includes the names also of Lankester Harding, Alkin Lewis, and the late J. L. Starkey, and acknowledgments are made in the Foreword and the Introduction to several other assistants and scholars. The ostraca, eighteen in number, written in iron-carbon ink with a reed or wood pen, were dug up in 1935 in the guard-house at Lachish, and are letters to Ja-ûsh, believed to be the military governor of the city, from a certain Hoshaiah (who was located at an outpost) during the second Babylonian invasion under Nebuchadrezzar, towards the end of Zedekiah's reign (which closed 586 B.C., when Nebuchadrezzar captured and sacked Jerusalem). They are written in the ancient Phœnician script, but the language used is pure Biblical Hebrew. Professor Torczyner deserves the gratitude of all Old Testament scholars for the marvellous pains and ingenuity he has manifested in his decipherment of the writings. The volume contains excellent photographs of all the letters, with transliteration into Hebrew and translation into English, together with a commentary on each one, a Glossary of all the Hebrew words, a comparative table of all the Phœnician scripts, and several Indices.

The learned Professor's theory regarding the letters will not, however, appeal to all scholars who have studied them. The archæological evidence is conclusive that they were found in the soot and ashes connected with the final destruction of the city, and must therefore be dated about 588–587 B.C. But Torczyner's view is that they were concerned with the flight of the prophet Uriah to Egypt (which is stated in Jer 26 to have taken place in the reign of Jehoiakim), and that they were probably documents brought (shortly before Lachish fell) from the city archives to the guard-house for the purpose of trying Hoshaiah on charges of treachery connected with Uriah. Hence most of them were messages written, he believes, sometime before the inquiry, perhaps years before it, and not just before the fall of the city. He puts forward the view that the flight of this prophet and his death may not have taken place till the time of Zedekiah, and thus the letters do not need to be dated as far back as Jehoiakim's reign, but just a few years before the end of the monarchy. This theory seems rather fanciful, however, and does not accord with the archæology or the Biblical history of the time. From the layer in which the letters were found, they undoubtedly date from Nebuchadrezzar's invasion in 588 B.C.; and as they are all of the same type, and one of them (referring to fire-signals) is admitted to have been written during the invasion, it is evident that all of them belong to the same time of tension and alarm at the close of the monarchy. The idea that they may have formed the court-dossier of Hoshaiah at some military trial has nothing to support it.

The theory, too, that the prophet mentioned in them is Uriah will not be accepted by the majority of scholars, for this prophet was certainly put to death in Jehoiakim's time, and this would put the letters back as much as eleven years or more before the fall of Lachish. Torczyner, it is true, attempts to bring Uriah's death down into Zedekiah's time, and thinks the redactor has made a mistake in placing it under Jehoiakim, but the narrative (Jer $26^{22\text{ ff.}}$) is admitted by the most advanced critics to be authentic as it stands. It is not unlikely, indeed, that 'the prophet' (whose name is not given in the letters) was Jeremiah, for the statement in Letter VI. complaining of his words is practically identical with what is said of him in the Biblical record (Jer 38^4).

Torczyner's idea, moreover, that the Nedabiah mentioned in Letter III. as the bearer of one of the messages is to be identified with the 'grandson' of Jehoiakim (cf. I Ch 3^{18}) does not find favour with other scholars who have carefully studied the Phœnician script of the letters. The word which he transliterates נֶכֶד ('grandson') is clearly עֶבֶד ('servant'), and the royal grandson has nothing to do with the Nedabiah mentioned in the text. The former, indeed, on the most favourable estimate could not have been more than five years of age when Letter III. was written (according to Torczyner's date for it).

The volume will probably occasion considerable discussion and criticism. But if it should stimulate research into these invaluable documents, and reveal new points tending to clarify certain passages, great good will result. It is the reviewer's belief that scholarship will come to date all these letters to about February 587 B.C., only a few weeks or days before the fall of Lachish, and to see in 'the prophet' not Uriah, but Jeremiah, whose name seems to be clearly mentioned in Letter XVII.

Glenfarg. J. W. JACK.

Entre Nous.

Some Thoughts on Bereavement.

To write to a bereaved person is the most difficult of tasks, it always has been so, and possibly not till months after the blow has fallen can the letter be of any use. Then it may be re-read; and some chance saying in it may reach and comfort the lonely. Thus it is surely worth while to read with attention what other and more distinguished people have said, and have found to be of solid use.

Possibly the letter written by Arthur Balfour to Lady Desborough, when her son, Billy Grenfell, was killed after his brother Julian in the War, may not be as well known as it might be. Mrs. Edgar Dugdale (who writes the life of her uncle) tells us that Balfour set forth 'more plainly and unequivocally than anything else ever put on paper, his feelings about death.' The gist of the letter lies in the fact that he entertains no doubt whatever about a future life. ('I deem it at least as certain as any of the hundred-and-one truths of the framework of the world, as I conceive the world.') 'I am as sure that those I love and have lost are living to-day, as I am that yesterday they were fighting heroically in the trenches. The bitterness lies not in the thought that they are really dead, still less in the thought that I have parted with them for ever, for I think neither of these things.' He goes on to say that the bitterness lies in the certainty that, till he dies, he will never again see their smile or hear their voice, but then concludes victoriously—and here comes the steadfast helpful word: 'The pain is indeed hard to bear—too hard, it sometimes seems, for human strength; yet measured in the true scale of things *it is but brief*; death cannot long cheat us of love. . . .'

That is what we all long to give to the mourner

—something concrete to think about, and I have never met anything more felicitous than Baldwin's letter to Lady Cave on the death of her husband. 'In such unions,' Lord Baldwin wrote (the quotation is taken from *Lord Cave, a Memoir*, by Sir Charles Mallet), 'as we both know, there lies the certainty that before husband or wife there lies an ultimate path of deep sorrow. *In a way, you are bearing his burden*, the burden he would have had, if you had been called first. He has been spared what has fallen upon you.'

Another consolatory thought when suffering through the death of some one very dear, is that that friend who has departed would almost certainly deprecate a hopeless indulgence in sorrow, if he could return and speak. Henry Brewster, writing to Dame Ethel Smyth, thus expressed it, I quote from the memoir of Brewster prefacing *The Prison*, 'X reproached her grandfather, and very rightly, for giving way to clamorous grief; I feel so differently about death, that though their sorrow touches me, I should not like to be mourned for thus. "My peace I leave with you." These are beautiful words, gentle and proud. I would like to be able to say them in some measure.'

And have we not the great fact to rely on that, as the years pass, Love does not die. Looking through an old volume of poems by Madame Darmesteter the other day we found some lines that expressed this fact perfectly . . .

Here, in the long light summer weather,
She brings the books they chose together,
And reads the verse he liked the most.
And here, as softly as a ghost,
Comes gliding through the winter gloom
To say her prayer beside the tomb
Of him she loved, and never lost.

CONSTANCE MILES.

Aldous Huxley.

In the April number of *Life and Work*, the Record of the Church of Scotland, there is a suggestive short article by the Rev. David Cairns, B.A., Bridge of Allan, on Aldous Huxley.

Mr. Cairns begins in this way: 'Aldous Huxley is one of our most significant writers to-day. He has written several novels, books of travel and of essays, and now he has produced *Ends and Means*—a diagnosis of the moral and political diseases of our age, together with a prescription which he hopes may lead to a cure. But all the way through his career, even in his novels, it has been as essayist and philosopher that he has excelled. Plot and character are not the main thing with him; he is bent on seeing the world through the eyes of the people about whom he writes; and he sees farther than Wells or Shaw—and, unlike them, he grows in insight as he goes on.

'In his earlier books this portrayal is strangely detached, witty, and cynical; and there is a definitely disagreeable sexual element. The intention of this is not to corrupt, it is rather the depicting of a world with which the writer is growing more and more dissatisfied and disgusted. Before long Huxley begins to see that the haphazard freedom which he has described leads to the destruction of personality. In his later books a remarkable change has come over him. Now he believes that there is a certain kind of life which is worth living, and it is a proof of his new earnestness that he is now no longer content with mocking or sneering, but is trying to formulate certain rules for living which may save the world from impending disaster. And he sees that this ideal has no claim at all on men unless the universe itself has also a meaning.

'So it is natural that in the closing chapters of *Ends and Means* he should give an account of his beliefs about God and the Universe. For he sees that men's conception of their duty depends on the kind of God they believe in, and he revolts against all worship of the State as divine, and the consequent moral code that "whatever serves the State is right." In his books one sees this line of thought steadily developing. At first, in *Crome Yellow*, there is given a detached picture of the world. In *Point Counterpoint* you have a reaction of disgust against the meaninglessness and indiscipline of modern life; in *Brave New World* you have a picture of the things that planning may lead to in a State that has rejected all spiritual values. *Eyeless in Gaza* depicts the breakaway of a captive from the grinding mill of a meaningless life. In this book Antony Beavis rejects the planning of the Communist agitators, and advances towards a new ethic of non-violence and co-operation. And now in *Ends and Means* we have a systematic exposition of the same theme as is treated in the form of a novel in *Eyeless in Gaza*.'

There is no doubt that there were many people who read more into *Eyeless in Gaza* than was actually there. They wanted to believe that Huxley had already, in it, travelled far along the Christian path. *Ends and Means* makes it clear that though he has indeed travelled far from his earlier materialism, his present position cannot be identified with Christianity. Chapter xiv., entitled 'Beliefs,' shows that the God in which he believes is an impersonal God, ‘an impersonal spiritual reality underlying all being.’ ‘All the great religions have taught the necessity of transcending personality; but the Christians have made it particularly difficult for themselves to act upon this teaching. They have accompanied the injunction that men should lose their lives in order to save them by the assertion that God Himself is a person and that personal values are the highest that we can know.’ Not only should personality not be attributed to God, but it would be wrong to attribute goodness to Him. ‘God is not good.’ Here it may be Huxley narrows ‘goodness’ down until it is equivalent with ethic morality—God is non-moral.

Men, on their side, must strive for an experience of mystical union with an impersonal union with an impersonal—super-personal—God. The way of spiritual experience is by meditation. ‘Meditation is the technique of mysticism. Properly practised with due preparation, physical, mental and moral, meditation may result in a state of what has been called “transcendental consciousness”—the direct intuition of, and union with, an ultimate spiritual reality that is perceived as simultaneously beyond the self and in some way within it.’

It will be seen, from this quotation that the preparation for mysticism demands, on men’s part, morality. ‘Virtue is the essential preliminary to the mystic experience.’ ‘If we would transcend personality we must first take the trouble to become persons.’

Is Dogma Dull?

Miss Dorothy L. Sayers, the well-known author, whose Canterbury play, *In the Zeal of Thy House*—a play full of spiritual significance—is at present attracting much attention in London, has contributed a striking article to *The Sunday Times* of April 10. We quote a few paragraphs from the article.

‘We are constantly assured that the churches are empty because preachers insist too much upon doctrine—“dull dogma,” as people call it. The fact is the precise opposite. “It is the neglect of dogma that makes for dullness. The Christian faith is the most exciting drama that ever staggered the imagination of man—and the dogma is the drama.”

‘The plot pivots upon a single character, and the whole action is the answer to a single central problem: *What think ye of Christ?* . . . The Church’s answer is categorical and uncompromising, and it is this: That Jesus Bar-Joseph, the carpenter of Nazareth, was, in fact and in truth, and in the most exact and literal sense of the words, the God “by whom all things were made.”’

‘He was not a kind of dæmon or fairy pretending to be human; He was in every respect a genuine living man. He was not merely a man so good as to be “like God”—He *was* God. ‘Now, this is not just a pious commonplace; it is not commonplace at all. For what it means is this, among other things: that, for whatever reason, God chose to make man as he is—limited and suffering and subject to sorrow and death.

‘He can exact nothing from man that He has not exacted from Himself. He has Himself gone through the whole of human experience, from the trivial irritations of family life and the cramping restrictions of hard work and lack of money to the worst horrors of pain and humiliation, defeat, despair, and death. When He was a man, He played the man. He was born in poverty and died in disgrace, and thought it well worth while.

‘If this is dull, then what, in Heaven’s name, is worthy to be called exciting? The people who hanged Christ never, to do them justice, accused Him of being a bore—on the contrary, they thought Him too dynamic to be safe. It has been left for later generations to muffle up that shattering personality and surround Him with an atmosphere of tedium.’

The Rev. Binney Simpson Black, a Presbyterian minister in Ontario, writing in *The Congregational Quarterly* for April on ‘The Sermon Needed To-day,’ strikes the same note as Miss Sayers. This is what he has to say on sensation: ‘One type of sermon is generally condemned. It is called the Sensational Sermon. When the nature of the sensation is properly understood, I confess to a strong attachment to this sermon. . . . Too many sermons are dull and uninteresting. The devil of dullness must be cast out. . . . Make way, then, for a bit of sensation in the sermon. It is needed to-day. It always was needed. Can you imagine John the Baptist returning and preaching among us to-day and not producing a sensation? . . . The great sermons of history have been sensational sermons. If they had not been, they would not be on record to this hour. Chrysostom was so outspoken that he got himself exiled three times and finally died from hardships away from home. It needed his sensational preaching in a time-serving generation. . . . The Master’s discourses produced a sensation. So did Peter’s sermon on the Day of Pentecost . . . and Paul’s sermon on Mars Hill was sensational.

'Someone asked Henry Ward Beecher what he thought of sensational preaching. He explained that if it meant the gaining of a low passing success by mere trickery, he was against it, but if it meant "preaching which produced a sensation," he was for it. But the minister who forgets that the Gospel is the real sensation, and depends upon his own peculiar methods and amazing fertility in conjuring up topics that will tickle and thrill, will have to go one better every week. He will merit the description by a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church: "He is like a dog with a can tied to his tail—he has got to run a little faster every minute to keep ahead of the can." . . .

'There is sensational preaching which burlesques the Gospel and degrades the Church. From this we turn away. But we plead for that which is sensational in the noblest sense, reverent, scriptural, spiritual, wholesome, producing a sensation by the power of the truth.'

His Friends.

There have been several memoirs of Canon H. R. L. Sheppard and now this month one has been issued by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton—*Dick Sheppard*, by His Friends. 'By His Friends.' There is something singularly fitting and touching in this phrase for Dick Sheppard had a genius for friendship. Canon J. K. Mozley, speaking of this, says: 'My memory takes me back to Carlyle's famous definition of genius—an infinite capacity for taking pains. Certainly Dick took pains; he thought it worth while to let his friends know that he remembered their needs, or something that had emerged in the course of conversation, or some action of theirs which had given him pleasure.' A friend wrote: 'His was an amazing understanding of human nature: it was rooted in an almost uncanny sensitiveness to the needs and ideals of ordinary people.' 'Talking to Mr. Murry once, Dick Sheppard said: "Faith? I don't believe I know anything about Faith, Middleton. But Jesus is my *God*. I don't believe I have any faith except that: but I have a love for men; somewhere in me I have love. I *hang* on to that."'

A story which is not well-known, and which is perhaps the most touching of all the incidents given in the volume, refers to his early days in the Bethnal Green Settlement. 'The telephone bell rang one afternoon in the Oxford House Settlement in Bethnal Green. A resident answered the call, and heard a policeman ask if there was anyone at the House by the name of H. R. L. Sheppard. The resident replied that there certainly *had* been a head of the House by that name, but that he left some twenty-five years ago! The officer then went on to say that a man had been found dead on the Embankment, a down-and-out, and the only thing on him was a letter, headed with the address of the Oxford House, and signed with the name H. R. L. Sheppard. In twenty-five years of a life of poverty and struggle, this unknown man had thought only one of his possessions worth keeping—a letter from Dick Sheppard!'

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have played their part well. This is one of the most attractive volumes we have seen, with its pale grey linen binding, light weight, good printing, and its delightful portfolio of portraits. The price is only 5s., and it should be noted that all the royalties are to be paid to the funds of the St. Martin-in-the-Fields Relief Committee.

Thinking it Out.

'What is Christianity?'; 'Why should I call Jesus Divine?'; 'Why did Jesus go to the Cross?'; 'What does it mean to be saved?'; 'Why should I support foreign missions?'; 'Does God do anything?'; 'How shall I make God real?' These were the questions that were asked Mr. G. T. Bellhouse, the minister of Regent Square Presbyterian Church, not once but many times, and he found that although there were many books written in theological language for the expert it was difficult to find suitable books for young people. And while most of the larger books dealt with one problem only it was almost impossible to find anything which tried to cover the ground of all the everyday problems of faith. So he set himself to write *Thinking It Out*. In 'The Christian Year' for the Sunday after Ascension we have given extracts from his chapter on 'Does Prayer Make Any Difference?' and these will show how well and clearly Mr. Bellhouse has dealt with the difficulties which arise on this subject in the minds of many thoughtful people. It is a book to be commended for many purposes, but it will be found specially useful by ministers to give to the members of their Confirmation and Young Communicants' classes (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net).

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works,
and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street,
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings
Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

The chief business of the Church is to interpret to the world the meaning of the Cross, and so Christian eyes must ever be peering afresh into the depth of that divine mystery. To see with clearness and to express in simple language what has been seen is no easy task. So we have books on the Atonement which are profound, difficult, sometimes controversial, and often to the plain man not spiritually helpful.

In this connexion we can warmly commend an unpretentious little book on *The Obedience of the Cross*, by Canon J. O. F. Murray of Ely Cathedral (S.P.C.K.; 3s. net). It contains a series of addresses which have been given at retreats in Holy Week. The characteristic of these addresses is their simplicity and logical coherence combined with depth of spiritual feeling.

It will be universally agreed that we see in the Cross a revelation of obedience and a revelation of love, both perfectly displayed and tested by death. It is a complete expression of all that our human nature was created to become. 'We can feed our souls by the contemplation of it in the presence of God the Father, knowing that there is in it a sacrifice of a sweet savour, in which we and He can rejoice together.' It is the perfect example of that living sacrifice of ourselves to God in loyalty and love which is our reasonable service. As such it stands before the world for ever as the ideal and pattern, however far short we may come of expressing it in our daily life.

But there is far more than that in the teaching of the New Testament. When we ask why was it necessary for Christ to die, His own words leave us in no doubt as to the answer. He came, and He knew that He had come, to give His life a ransom, to shed His blood for the remission of sins. However much the modern mind may be repelled by the sacrificial system of the Old Testament, and however alien its symbols and ideas may seem to us, 'it is no accident that the Cross itself can only yield up its deepest secret to us in proportion as we are able to grasp the reality which underlies and interprets the sacrificial symbols.' The essence of that symbolism was the identification of the sinner with the victim and the laying of his sin on the victim's head. Our Lord's own words leave no doubt that with clear conscience and deliberate intent He accepted the position of victim on behalf of His people, and 'made His soul an offering for sin.' 'The perfection of His love and of His purity, together with the closeness of the bond uniting Him to the brethren whose flesh and blood He shared, made it inevitable that He should feel as a weight on His own heart, by no legal fiction but in awful reality, the guilt and shame of His people's sin.'

This sacrifice, offered in love, is represented as in some way giving satisfaction to God. On the basis of this theories of the Atonement have been framed which set the redeeming love of Christ in sharp contrast with the righteousness of God. But this has no ground in the New Testament. 'There is, no doubt, a real sense in which the heart of the Father, pierced through and through with our ingratitude, our distrust, our rebellion must find eternal satisfaction, a real return for all His lavish bounty, in the perfect obedience, love, and trust of His Son.' But the Bible knows nothing of any conflict between the claims of God's righteousness and the yearnings of His love. 'Indeed, so far from representing God as requiring sacrifice or propitiation, the Bible quite clearly and consistently throughout shows us God as Himself the Source of the propitiation, the Author of the sacrifice; Himself, if we may dare to use the phrase, as the supreme Sufferer; and the Cross as the final expression of the love, not of the Son only, but of the Father.'

Here we are faced with an immense difficulty which has weighed heavily upon the modern mind with its profound conviction of the reign of inexorable law. We are told that no atonement of any kind is in fact possible, that our Christian faith in the forgiveness of sins is an immoral delusion. This is stressed not merely by opponents of the faith. Dean Inge, for example, writes: 'The laws of the moral and spiritual life are just as inexorable as those of the physical world. Nothing worth having is given away; all must be earned. . . . It matters little whether cheap forgiveness is offered as the result of the magical efficacy of the Sacraments, or as the result of being "washed in the precious blood of the Lamb." In either case it is false. Spiritual laws are inexorable.'

Can the forgiveness we believe in be fairly described as 'cheap,' and how far is it consistent with our belief in inexorable law? These are questions which must be faced, and in facing them we may discover that forgiveness is not such a simple and matter-of-course thing as we may have been in the habit of thinking. Our words and actions do not simply go forth from us but they leave their influence behind upon ourselves. There is a real bond uniting us to every act we have ever done, to every word we have ever spoken, to every thought we have ever harboured and made our own. Moreover, 'our lives are continuous wholes in themselves, and they are inextricably bound up with the lives of others and with the life of God.' What power has forgiveness to cut these connexions and break these bonds? Easy-going ourselves we may find it natural to suppose that God is as easy-going as we are. But 'we can accept no doctrine of forgiveness, St. Paul clearly would have accepted none, that is inconsistent with this principle. "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."'

Dr. Westcott has well said that we do not need a revelation to assure us of the certainty of punishment, but we do need the gospel to enable us to believe in the possibility of forgiveness. It is true that Jesus treats the readiness of God to forgive as a matter of course, and without the Cross we might be led to think of forgiveness as a cheap and easy thing. But there is another element in the teaching of Jesus according to which He makes plain that God's forgiveness, while it is free, is not indiscriminate or unconditioned. It demands repentance. In the parable of the unforgiving servant He teaches that forgiveness is no mechanical occurrence, but stands in some vital connexion with the attitude and character of the sinner. There would seem to be a law governing forgiveness according to which 'the link which binds a man to his past and which gives validity to the spiritual debt that he incurs by his violation of the divine law is not formal and mechanical, but organic and vital. So that it cannot be destroyed once for all. It needs to be continually counteracted by a power coming from God into a heart open to receive it. The sense of guilt returns upon a man with full force whenever, for any reason, he shuts the door of his heart against the operation of that power.' We have at least the assurance that forgiveness is not simply the abrogation of law, but is a divine power operating by a law of its own.

Can we discern any harmony between the law of inexorable consequences and the law of forgiveness? Perhaps in some degree we may. The case would seem to be simplest in regard to the man who sins. What he did cannot be altered, but through repentance he has become in a real sense a new man, not the same as he who committed the sin. Take the case of Paul the Apostle. 'He is still the man that once persecuted the Church. What, then, has happened that we feel that he can no longer be justly judged in the light of that fact? Is it not this? The act itself is unchanged, but his own attitude towards it has been completely transformed. It did express him once. Now, with his whole soul, he has repudiated it. The time was when he was capable of it. We now know that it is a moral impossibility that he should ever be guilty of it again. Forgiveness, then, in this case does not imply any, the least, condonation of the offence.'

With this radical change in a man's character the physical consequences of his sin, though not outwardly changed, become different in their aspect and their effect. They become to the penitent who can so accept them a discipline for good at the hand of a loving and reconciled Father.

The case is more obscure when we consider the reaction of our sins upon our fellow-men. 'Can the seducer be forgiven while the victim of his seduction is left to perish in her shame? I know of no more awful aspect of the problem than this, especially for those who, by their office, are set to watch over the souls of others, as those that must give an account, not only for what they do, but also for what they leave undone.' Here we can but fall back upon the faith that the Judge of all the earth may be trusted to do right, and that that very solidarity of the human race through which men influence one another for evil has become in Christ the very instrument of our salvation. Moreover, though it be but a bare imagination, 'who can say that it is impossible that He, the God of the spirits of all flesh, may somehow, somewhere, and sometime give His children the opportunity of humbling themselves before each of their brothers whom they have wronged, and so entering with them into the fullness of the forgiveness of God?'

From all this it appears that the gospel teaches no cheap forgiveness, no easy-going, good-natured Governor of the universe, but a holy and loving Father who ordained death as the inevitable penalty of sin, and who sent His Son to honour the law and at infinite cost to Himself to redeem men from their sin. 'It costs us nothing because it cost Him everything. Does that make His forgiveness cheap? If you keep His forgiveness before the eyes of your heart it will cost you all your sin.'

Of the eight handsome books, published by Messrs. Allen & Unwin, containing records of 'Oxford, 1937,' it is very difficult to select one for some detailed notice. All are good, and we hope that they will find their way into many a minister's library.

To give our readers a taste of a very rich feast of many courses, we must almost arbitrarily select one, and even so we must confine attention—again and even more arbitrarily—to one chapter. So let us take C. H. Dodd's contribution to the volume *The Kingdom of God and History*, one of eight volumes on the general topic 'Church, Community, and State. Let us also say that the other contributors to this particular volume are all eminent and well worth attention—H. G. Wood, E. Bevan, E. Lyman, Paul Tillich, H. D. Wendland, and Christopher Dawson.

'The Kingdom of God and History'—it is an interesting theme. How are the two related? Is the Kingdom to come when history has run its course, and if so, in what sense? As crown, or contrast? Or has the Kingdom come already, and has it been playing its part in history all along? And what does the petition mean, 'Thy Kingdom come'? Such questions have perplexed many, and even Professor Dodd may not fully satisfy everybody. But his discussion should at least make some points clear and others clearer.

He begins with a very suggestive, informative, and brilliantly executed account of the precursors of the New Testament view of the Kingdom of God among Hebrews and Greeks. Greek philosophy did not, of course, speak of the Kingdom of God, but it had something corresponding in the Platonic 'realm of ideas.' To Greek thought the realm of Nature and the field of history could not be man's true home. They were the changeful 'Many,' and the spirit of man quested for the 'One,' for the truly real, perfect, and changeless, against the eddying, unstable realm of 'the Many.' The 'ideal' world was not in history, it was supersensible, supernatural, outside Time. To escape from 'history' was the quest of man's soul, to rise above Time and change his supreme felicity.

The Hebrews on the other hand were not primarily interested in the metaphysics of 'the One and the Many.' They were interested in the moral problem of the existence of evil in a world which God had made, and in its conquest and disappearance. To rise not above change but above evil was their supreme quest. To them the world was real, history was real and unrepeatable; and God guided, and from time to time intervened in, mundane affairs. Conceiving His Kingdom to mean primarily the destruction of evil, prophets found solace in looking forward to a Divine intervention. But so real was 'history' to them that they pictured this intervention as future happenings within 'history.' As 'apocalyptic' developed, however, those predictions assumed more and more fantastic forms. In a real sense the end was to write *finis* to 'history.' The Kingdom would be 'beyond the order of time and space.' Yet it is that super-historical happening, so to say, which to the mind of the Hebrew prophet gives all history its significance. Here, of course, is an approximation to Greek thought. The Apocalyptist regards the Age to Come not simply as another period of history still in the future, but as 'an order of being essentially superior to the present order, which will enter into human experience when this order ends.'

Thus in Jewish thought there lay at least in germ that distinction between the Kingdom as immanent and as transcendent which the New Testament shows and to which other contributors to this volume devote attention.

Professor Dodd goes on to show that so far Christianity took over the Jewish *schema* of eschatology but 'made one profound and fundamental change.' Whereas Jewish eschatology looked to the close of the historical process as the necessary fulfilment upon which the meaning of history depends, 'Christianity found the fulfilment of history in an actual series of events within history—the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus and the emergence of the Church as the bearer of His Spirit.' For the Christians prophecy was fulfilled in Christ. The Kingdom of God was no longer something to look forward to, it was something to be enjoyed. The Kingdom had come. The expected Second Coming was only the return of One who had already come. 'The understanding of history and of God's action in history no longer depends upon "vision" of an imaginary future. On the contrary, the Christian vision of the future depends upon experience of actual historical events.'

Attempts were made to reconstruct eschatology so as to allow for the new facts within the traditional scheme; but such broke down, and 'millenarianism' fell into the background in the main Church tradition. And categories of Greek thought were used even by the theologians of the New Testament 'to express the absoluteness of the revelation in Christ.'

'The Kingdom of God is not something yet to come. It came with Jesus Christ, and in its coming was perceived to be eternal in its quality.' What then is meant by the petition 'Thy Kingdom come'? 'We are not praying that at long last history may end with Utopia or the Millennium, but that in *this* situation in which we stand the reign of God may be made manifest after the pattern of its revelation in Christ.' 'It is not in the future that we must seek the perfection of which the temporal is not capable, but in that other world in which the ultimate meaning of history resides, where "our life is hid with Christ in God."'

As already remarked it is rather doubtful if this interpretation of the petition will satisfy everybody. Professor DODD does leave it obscure as to what value, if any, he would retain for the apocalyptic expectation of 'a Second Coming in great power and glory' which is cherished in some measure by many. But this will be granted that his interpretation will enable many to utter the petition with renewed fervour due to clearer understanding of at least one meaning of which it is capable, whatever else it means.

Mr. J. A. HOBSON, the well-known economist and the author of some twenty-five works on social theory and practice, has written what may be called a professional autobiography, in which he traces the course of his thinking on the subject which he has made peculiarly his own, *Confessions of an Economic Heretic* (reviewed under 'Literature'). There are more heresies in the book, however, than the economic. He is a religious heretic as well. And the most interesting thing in his confessions is the account he gives of his religious history. He tells us why he is a rationalist, and what made him one. It is a good thing for the believer to consider this.

He was brought up in an orthodox home, under the ministry of the Rev. Sholto Douglas, who over-satisfied the taste of his congregation with sermons of an hour and a quarter. That alone would not have turned Hobson from orthodoxy, but he found the doctrine preached impossible to believe. He could not reconcile with elementary reason the two doctrines of atonement and everlasting punishment. He went to Oxford in this mood of rebellion, and found nothing there to modify it, though Jowett, T. H. Green, and Mark Pattison were the leading figures. An intimate friendship with J. M. Robertson confirmed his negations, and extended them. And this rationalism may be said, with distinct modifications, to be his creed to-day.

After this biographical review Mr. HOBSON settles down, in a chapter entitled 'Western Christianity,' to a more systematic presentation of his case against Christianity and the Church. He thinks the churches have lost much of their former hold on their adherents, and he gives two suggestions as to the causes. In the first place, it is not due to conscious scepticism, but rather to a growing sense of the unreality of any other world or any other life than this. For how many church-goers to-day, he asks, has the doctrine of the Atonement any meaning? How many believe in the 'saving' of their souls? The interest of ordinary life has been immensely enlarged, and this has made the present, with its sport and amusement and work, and this alone, real.

The other, and deeper, reason for the failure of Christianity is its insistent attempts to foist on to Western nations, that are distinctively materialistic and individualistic in their real aims and interests, ideals of character and conduct out of keeping with their nature and traditions. The teaching of the Sermon on the Mount is so evidently divergent from our real feelings about men's and women's characters and conduct as to drive its teachers to all sorts of evasive interpretations.

The full Christian character is inherently and eternally alien to Western civilized man, his valuations and ideals. Some recognition of this truth is discernible in the Aryan-Christianity by which the Nazis seek to pour the substance of their barbaric faith into the emptied shell of the Christian creed. But it is not necessary for us to go as far as the Nazis in repudiating the ethics of Christianity. All we have to do is to refuse to recognize that Christ's ethics in the Sermon on the Mount have any application to modern social institutions. These are purely personal ethics.

It is for this reason the Christian churches must side with the owning classes in opposing as revolutionary any serious attempts of a democracy to reform the distribution of wealth. Everywhere the Christian churches are found ranging themselves with the 'conservative classes,' and this sight everywhere saps their influence among the class-conscious workers. This does not imply a condemnation of the churches for failure to carry out a social ethics of Christianity, but simply a recognition that the churches belong to the 'established order,' and confer a certain sacredness on their cause. In passing it may be hazarded that many readers will open their eyes in astonishment at such a statement. But there is more to follow.

The coincidence of Protestantism with the rise of modern Capitalism was no accident of history. Capitalism could not have found its necessary freedom under the dominion which the Romish Church exercised over the conduct of secular life. Protestantism made a positive contribution in the value its churches set on economic virtues like honesty, industry, and thrift. It thus gave a spiritual sanction to successful business. But upon the whole Protestantism made for the dissociation of the religious from the secular life, the week-day ethics from the Sabbath, and as time went on reduced religion to a set of ideals, rules, and dogmas which had less and less reality in the ordinary ways of men.

But while the full substance of this Eastern faith is now widely recognized as impracticable for an operative principle in the Western world, it is not right to conclude that religion in its broader spiritual and philosophical sense is disappearing or weakening. If religion be taken to mean man's emotional concern for his life as a moral and rational personality in an ever-enlarging human society, and his interest in the discovery of an order in the universe to which man by the use of his conscious faculties may contribute, such a religion is gradually but certainly growing, not only among the sensitive and intellectual minorities of each people, but as a pervasive motive in the minds of many.

And then follows a rather remarkable passage in which Mr. Hobson seems to make a breach in his rationalism. He speaks of man as 'the highest present product of powers which permeate the universe and inspire in various combinations and degrees all the creatures and events which constitute the universe.' And, further, of a system 'inspired and moulded by some evolving process that may be realized as purpose or even spirit.' For the nineteenth-century scientific rejection of purposes or spiritual hypotheses was, he adds, clearly overdone. 'Among our leading scientists and philosophers there is little of that pride of intellectual self-sufficiency so blatant in mid- or late-Victorian times. Many of them admit some other faculty than reason as a means of getting truth. Materialism, Determinism, Rationalism are all discarded as inadequate instruments for reaching the highest realms of truth and for explaining the nature of a changing world.'

At several points in his book Mr. Hobson seems to confess that he has been somewhat shaken by modern psychology and its indictment of reason as an instrument of truth. But there is more than psychology behind the passage quoted above. This distinguished economist, who began as severe rationalist, and who probably calls himself one still, has at least arrived at the recognition of a spiritual element, and even a purpose, in this changing world. Is it not just a step to the recognition of Christ as the highest embodiment of that purpose and that spiritual element?

◆

Worship and Sacraments.

By the Reverend J. E. Rattenbury, D.D., London.

1. There can be little doubt that the importance of Eucharistic worship is being felt increasingly in the Evangelical Churches. The revolt, not only nor perhaps so much of the great Reformers as of their disciples and followers, seems to many of the sons of the Reformation to have gone too far. The desire for richer and more varied forms of worship has been a marked feature of British Evangelical Communions in this century. The causes of this are complex. A deepened understanding, partly due to modern psychological thought, of the meaning, unrealized in a sterner individualistic period, of corporate worship has influenced many minds. A richer sense of the goodness and beauty of life has resulted from a new reverence of the Incarnation, and caused a critical attitude to the spiritual isolation of religion from life in former times. The bareness of much Protestant worship seems to many to belong to a past period. And then the prophetic note of the Reformer's pulpit, and the deeply objective significance of the Word of the Lord, so necessary where worship was bare and simple, is not very characteristic of most modern preaching. Where the altar is absent and the pulpit too often discusses religion instead of declaring the gospel Word, worship has been deprived of the sense of the approach of God to His people, which is essential to its significant use. The bareness and stern simplicity of ancient Protestant worship can only be maintained at a high spiritual temperature both in pulpit and in pew, and is rather for the select or elect than common humanity. Hence man's thought reverts to Eucharistic worship and discovers, even if the pulpit does not declare the Word in compulsive accents, that the altar silently but always preaches it. Whatever else it does or does not do the Eucharist does 'proclaim the Lord's death till he come,' and what is that but the Word of the gospel?

2. The abuses of Eucharistic worship with which the Reformers dealt were such as to necessitate a drastic use of the knife, which sometimes not only destroyed the poisonous growth but wounded the body of which it was a noxious parasite. The commercialization of the Mass, the superstitions and abuses which gathered round it, the elaborate and pernicious Sacerdotal system, the 'Sacrifices of Masses' which the Anglican Articles described as 'blasphemous fables' and 'dangerous deceits' were evils which could not be lightly treated, and men like Calvin and Knox wrought a work of purification, which was vitally necessary for the preservation of spiritual Christianity. But whether their drastic surgery did no damage to the worshipping body, as worshippers, is a question which cannot be evaded. The enormous debt which we owe to the Reformers should not blind us to the losses which great reforms inevitably bring in their wake, nor prevent a work of restoration when it is possible.

By the emphasis of the rights of the Individual Soul the Reformation has given modern Christians a priceless heritage; but worship has a corporate significance, overstressed though it was by Roman Institutionalism, the value of which is better understood to-day. The Mediæval Church took the infant to her bosom in baptism, and made herself responsible for his salvation by means of her Sacerdotal system up till the day when she gave him 'extreme unction,' and then pursued him after death and made him a source of commercial profit! The Institution enslaved the Individual. Luther cut ruthlessly through this tangled wood, and made his way—*per una selva oscura*—to the throne of grace. The great experience which came to him profoundly influenced not only his theological thinking but the whole conception of Protestant worship, which became a mode of the individual's search for God. It ignored, perhaps denied, corporate religious values. Harnack criticised severely the later Lutherans who taught 'a specific (religious) value of public worship,' and states that Luther's view was that 'Public divine service can have no other aim, no other course, no other means, than the divine service of the individual has; for God treats with us simply through the Word.'[1]

Luther's liberation of the human soul from the prison of mediæval Institutionalism was possibly the greatest boon he conferred on mankind. The free and unobstructed access of a man to God is a claim fundamental to Protestantism. Bernard Shaw is undoubtedly right in finding the essence of Protestantism in the dignity of the independent man, the extent of which he nobly illustrates, by his quotation of the words of Job. 'Though he slay me yet will I trust in him; *but I will maintain my own ways before him.*'

---

[1] *History of Dogma*, vii. 221 f.

The right of immediate access to God was of such importance in that day of Institutionalism, and was so amazing an enfranchisement, that no one need wonder at the Reformers' stress on the individual even in public worship. But whether reformed worship, in its reaction from mediævalism, possessed sufficient appreciation of the social character of mankind or saw the value of corporate worship is another matter.

God can be apprehended immediately but surely mediately also. The centurion said, 'Speak the Word only,' but the woman with the issue of blood found Sacramental vestments in the simple garments of Jesus which she touched so tremblingly. Her faith turned the Capernaum road into a Mount of Transfiguration, and the garments of the Lord who walked it were to that faith as glistening as the robes of Hermon.

But the question of 'media,' of means of grace is of less importance to individuals than to communities. If worship has a corporate meaning other than that which is an addition of the values it has for each individual, the question of mediateness, of means of grace, comes into prominence. Christian worship is a corporate act of devotion in response to the Divine initiative. But if Harnack is right in his account of Luther's views, quoted above, all public worship on man's side is merely a number of isolated and individual acts of faith to which nothing can be added of religious value by corporate action. Such individualism is difficult for a modern man to accept. Social psychology tells us another story, and the New Testament confirms it. 'We are all members one of another.' While we have undoubtedly individual relations to God, which were so forcefully expressed by the Reformers for our lasting benefit, there are some relations of life in which we are fractions not units. We are children of a family—and members of the body of Christ—the Church. Our model prayer is not individualistic, but social. *Our* Father! So public worship as such is primarily the act of the community as a whole—as a unit—in response to the Divine Word mediated through Scripture, Sermon, and Sacrament. Praise and prayer are at once a response and a quest, and the quest, though in a lower degree, is worship as well as the response.

When worship is corporate it demands rites whereby the common mind expresses itself. We find them to some extent in hymns, whereby the worshipping Church not only responds to the Word but participates in it. The pulpit declares the Word to which the people respond, but the Eucharist properly understood, on its human side, is the act not only of the celebrant but of the Church which is the true priesthood, and is a corporate declaration of the gospel Word. We participate in its benefits, but we are co-performers in its action. It is the great corporate devotion, not prophetical as the pulpit is, where one man is the voice of the Word, but priestly in the democratic sense in which the whole body of believers is a royal priesthood, using mediate forms and rites both in their approach to God, and their acceptance of Him who comes to His Holy Temple. 'Is it not,' as Wesley asked, 'the *outward visible means* whereby God conveys into our souls all that spiritual grace, that righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost which were purchased by the body of Christ once broken and the blood of Christ once shed for us.' [1]

The mention of Wesley is important. His teaching of the 'means of grace' as the ordinary channels whereby God blesses men was developed in reaction from certain logical but unbalanced deductions from Luther's, as he called it, 'crazy solifidianism.' Wesley's sense of corporate religion and the value of Sacramental rites as outward and visible means of grace have had a great influence in restoring the balance between the excesses of Institutional and Individualistic religion. His witness brought a new stream of life into the too individualistic Protestant worship of his day. The revival of the eighteenth century was Eucharistic as well as Evangelical. Worship regarded as corporate and mediate may in some sense be a Catholic rather than a Protestant principle, but its increasing acceptance by men aware of the findings of modern social psychology can not be denied.

3. The origins of Eucharistic worship are to be found in the Apostolic Age. While it was based on the Lord's Supper, carried out its instructions, and used its symbols, the death and resurrection of Jesus, in the nature of the case, made reorientation of ideas of worship for the Apostles natural and obvious. The distinctive facts of the rite were the presence of the Invisible Lord with His people, and the memorial of His sacrificial death. By this it is not meant that Christ did not institute it, but what is meant is that in the Eucharist Christ is not our fellow-worshipper but the object of our worship, the mediator of a New Covenant, in whom we come to God and find Him there. From the first the Eucharist was Christocentric.

---

[1] *Works*, v. [1856] 183.

The forms of worship which issued undoubtedly expressed the experience of early Christians and their hopes.

Our earliest definite information about the Eucharist shows it had already taken ritual form. Paul was not creating a new ritual for Corinth, but conforming Corinthian worship to that of other churches. The usage was in existence as we have incontrovertible testimony in Corinth in A.D. 55, and that testimony as certainly witnesses to its previous history. From the earliest times it was the usage of the Early Church. One can find no descriptions of Christian worship outside the Scriptures where it is not the conspicuous distinctive feature. The public worship of the early Christians was modelled on synagogue worship, which they evangelized. Hymns, Scriptures, prayers, and discourses were used, but the distinctive Christian service was the Eucharist, before the celebration of which non-members of the Church were dismissed, and those prepared by the earlier common devotions, who confessed the name, were the participants in the Eucharistic act. It was always a rite. In its earlier days prayers were extemporary, but the great devotion was the central symbolical and sacramental worship. The liturgies which developed in many places were often subjected to reform, but at the Table of the Lord the Christians found their meeting-place and trysting ground, and worshipped in act as well as word. It was the Lord's Service of the Lord's Day for the Lord's people. Other devotions took place in which men spoke as the spirit moved them. They were of importance; the lack of them is always a peril to the Church. But the distinctive public worship of early Christians, though including preaching, was the Eucharist. Whatever abuses gathered round it, the Eucharist remained the normal service of the Church in this country until the Reformation, as it does in all ancient Churches. The communion with the Living Christ at His own Table, and the memorial of His atoning death were so universally observed that it must be called the Christian service *par excellence*. Its restoration to its true place is required not only by modern needs, but by any Christians who claim to base their devotions on Holy Scripture and early Christianity. The weekly celebration of it is no return to Rome, but behind Rome, to early conquering missionary Christianity. Whatever was included in it, or led up to it, it meant communion with a living present Lord and participation in the benefits of His sacrifice.

4. Can Eucharistic devotion be generally restored in Protestant worship? Was not free expression of the Spirit also a New Testament practice? It certainly was and cannot be neglected with impunity. But free prophetical expression does not characterize in any marked degree normal modern Protestant worship; and formalism, however thin the form, does. The problem is not whether wider liberty should be given to the exercise of charismatic gifts, but what should be the norm of public worship.

Should the preaching service of British Evangelical Churches be the norm, or the Eucharist? Luther's belief in the Eucharist was because of the Word in it. The Word to him was the true Sacrament, whether in the pulpit or on the altar. That is the crux of the whole matter. Is the pulpit the best method? In many churches for weeks together it is the only one of preaching the Word. That the Word may be a Sacrament is true—an efficient symbol whereby miraculous changes are made in men's lives. But that the Eucharist is the Word is also true. It proclaims the Lord's death till He comes. Why should one exclude the other? There is a place for the Sermon and the Scriptures in Eucharistic liturgies. The altar does not exclude the pulpit. Notwithstanding exceptions in Lutheranism the tendency towards infrequent communion has characterized all Reformed Churches. That has often been true in Anglicanism, despite the witness of Andrewes, Laud, the Non-Jurors, and the Wesleys. And Methodists have quite failed both in America and England to celebrate Holy Communion, according to their founder's advice, once a week. This widespread neglect may be partially due to prejudice but is more often due to the Memorialist theory which some authorities tell us it is not fair to attribute even to Zwingli, and certainly was not the teaching of Luther, Calvin, or Wesley. Do not these facts denote that for some reason or other Eucharistic worship will not succeed among Protestants? Whether Protestants can do without it is a question that modern Protestants would do well to face.

And yet nothing is clearer than the fact that the Eucharist preaches the Word. It preaches it when the pulpit is silent. The pulpit must consent on account of time limitations only to deal with aspects of the Word. But the symbols and liturgies of the Eucharist teach and mediate the redeeming gospel altogether and all the time. It preaches the Word in spite of abuses and errors when they creep in. It always witnesses to Christ incarnate, Christ present, Christ redeeming. It is the perpetual proclamation of the Lord's death till He come. The ideal of the pulpit is the same, but what of its actualities? If Protestantism means proclaiming the Word, experience has shown that the altar is more reliable than the pulpit. Men in the pulpit can preach anything to-day and often do; the altar cannot help proclaiming the gospel Word!

This does not mean that the pulpit can be relinquished and the altar substituted. The symbol of the altar might be misunderstood, and would frequently be misinterpreted were there no pulpit. The pulpit undoubtedly has functions which the altar lacks. They are not competitive but complementary modes of proclaiming the Word, but the eye is not less important than the ear; the route to the imagination is more travelled on than the route to the intellect; Italy needs salvation as well as Scotland. 'And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole body were hearing, where were the smelling?'

It must, however, be admitted that Eucharistic worship is not without its perils. But it is none the less the precious heritage of Evangelical Christianity. Sacerdotalism is the danger, but it is a peril well understood and is easily avoided when met by the true priesthood of the whole Church, which must function if it is to be preserved. Dr. P. T. Forsyth said a true thing when he claimed that the answer to Sacerdotalism is Sacramentalism. The value of Eucharistic religion is apparent the more deeply it is examined. It reaches to the centre and stretches to the circumference of our religion.

5. The value of Eucharistic worship is often argued to-day from the psychological standpoint, but there are others of greater importance. Yet psychological values, because they are not theological, must not be overlooked. In worship the worshipper matters, and also what stimulates worship. If it be true that all Christian worship is faith responding to the Word, it still matters that the mind should be inclined to subject itself to the Word, and that resistances should be overcome. Eucharistic worship creates atmosphere, appeals to the imagination, calls for co-operation, speaks to the eye as well as the ear. It is the gospel Word acted, the gospel presented as drama. It emphasizes the approach of God. It brings to the mind and the imagination the fundamental saving facts of Christianity. The symbolism is various and appealing. Much of this fits temperaments which the preaching method of proclaiming the Word does not reach, but were that all, were it merely a case of visual symbol as against vocal symbol, imaginative or æsthetic rites, as against intellectual or ethical appeal—or an addition to them—the psychological plea would not carry much conviction.

The Eucharist is Sacrament, not merely a Symbol. 'Symbol is only a reminder. . . . The sacrament, on the other hand, is not a hint, but an event, bringing not merely illumination but a summons to decision.'[1] As the spoken human language is a symbol, used by the Spirit to convict men and make it God's transforming Word, so that it becomes sacramental; so the bread and wine are the instruments which God uses to bring grace to men's hearts 'the outward and visible means by which He conveys His Grace.' God works, human experience shows it, through the Eucharist. And this in no way necessitates doctrines such as transubstantiation. The living God really acts through His ordained instruments and means of grace.

The value of Eucharistic worship for theology can hardly be exaggerated. If God were not incarnate in Christ, if the Saviour's death were not a real sacrifice for sins, if His presence were not vital to His Church, then the Sacrament would have no meaning except that of a crucifix, a memorial of death. One memento is as good as another, hence 'infrequency of Communion' would be a natural result.

The devotional and evangelical value of the Eucharist arises from its nature. Christ's presence is symbolized and mediated by the broken bread and His forgiveness received through the cup of salvation. This is what made the Wesleys such ardent Sacramentalists so that they sang:

This eucharistic feast
Our every want supplies;
And still we by His death are blessed,
And share His sacrifice.

The Atonement is received, but there remains a Sacrifice to be shared. Dr. Vincent Taylor, in his recent notable work, *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, has related the Atonement to the Eucharist more strongly perhaps than any previous Evangelical writer, and dares to suggest that, when by the sacrifice of ourselves, souls, and bodies, we share the sacrifice of Christ, our Sacrifice may be in a measure redemptive. May I quote one sentence from his admirable work: 'No modern presentation of the doctrine of the Atonement is likely to be satisfactory which ignores, or deals imperfectly with, the doctrine of the Eucharist. The Eucharist falls within the orbit of the Atonement alike by reason of the teaching of Jesus and of the life and experience of the Church.'[1]

---

[1] The Expository Times, March, 1938, p. 266.

It is not an uncommon experience to hear people say mournfully about some man who was once the life of their club or society, 'it has never been the same since poor So-and-So died!' Christians have never said that about Jesus though He died of torture! His society did not fade out when He died, it increased in strength every day. His followers did not mourn His loss, not because they did not love Him, *but because they had never lost Him*. He feasted with them at His own Table, and companied with those who met together in His name. They never said tearfully, 'Poor Jesus is dead, let us keep His memory green when we break bread together'! They sang hymns rejoicing in what His death had done:

> Worthy is the Lamb.

they sang.

It is only the presence of Him who was dead and is alive and has the keys which can keep the Church alive. His feasts have continued without break from the Upper Room to this day. It is His presence with His own which makes the Church. The meal to which He invites His people is the central fact of Christian public worship.

A new emphasis on Eucharistic worship, vigilantly guarded against the recurrence of old abuses, would issue not in a dead ritualism but in a living evangelism and a commanding sense of constraining love.

---

[1] P. 322.

◆

Literature.

THE DOCTRINAL INTEREST IN THE GOSPELS.

In his recently published volume, *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels* (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net), Professor R. H. Lightfoot, D.D., of Oxford has included four Lectures which were delivered at University College, Bangor, in January 1937, and two other Lectures which treat the special problems connected with the conclusion of Mark. The Bangor Lectures discuss the Resurrection narratives in Mark and Matthew, and compare them with the corresponding narratives in Luke and John, giving special attention to the question of *locality*. Professor Lightfoot thinks it significant that the difference in respect of locality in the Resurrection narratives is paralleled by the fact that, in representing the ministry of Jesus as a whole, Mark and Matthew give prominence to Galilee, while Luke and John emphasize the importance of Judæa, and, in the case of Luke, Samaria as well. Hitherto, we have had a simple explanation for this distribution of emphasis. We have supposed that it is due to the fact that Mark used Galilean traditions, while Luke and John followed special non-Galilean sources. If Professor Lightfoot is right, we have been too simple-minded. The differences spring from doctrinal roots! Mark, and following him Matthew, believed that 'the area of salvation' is Galilee, and not Judæa and Jerusalem; while Luke found that area in the whole land, in Galilee, Samaria, and Judæa alike, and perhaps especially in Jerusalem. For Mark 'Galilee is the sphere of revelation, Jerusalem the scene only of rejection' (p. 125). Luke, on the other hand, finds the goal in Jerusalem. In John shadow as well as light falls on Jerusalem, 'and Jerusalem holds the chief place . . . because the cross stood there' (p. 158). It is perhaps enough to state this theory in its nakedness. The serious feature is that the Lectures nowhere face its implications for the credibility of the Gospel tradition. A greater measure of objectivity appears in the two Lectures which treat the end of Mark's Gospel, at least so far as the linguistic aspect of the question is concerned. Professor Lightfoot is able to show, by assembling evidence from Plato, Aristotle, and the Septuagint, that sentences ending with γάρ are not unknown, though he is unable to cite a case of a book ending in this unimpressive way. He associates himself with Professor J. M. Creed in maintaining that the true end of Mk is 16^8. As a matter of form, he says, 'the use of γάρ at the close of Mk 16^8, although no doubt surprising, is probably not impossible, perhaps not even objectionable' (p. 15). His main contention is that Mk 14[28] and 16[7] point to an expectation on the part of certain sections of the Early Church that the Death and Resurrection were to be followed closely by the *Parousia* or Presence of the Risen Christ in Galilee. In other words, the words in Mk 16[7] contain the promise that the *Parousia* will take place in Galilee, and it is this message which the women fail to deliver. Students of the words: 'He goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him,' have apparently been mistaken in supposing that the Resurrection is meant. No wonder they think that the original ending of Mark's Gospel is lost! It remains to be seen whether they will feel compelled to retrace their steps under the influence of Professor Lightfoot's stimulating Lectures.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE BIBLE.

In *The Historical Background of the Bible* (Nelson; 7s. 6d. net), by Mr. J. N. Schofield, M.A.(Cantab.), B.D.(Lond.), Lecturer in Old Testament Studies and Hebrew, University of Leeds, we have a volume combining a record of Israel's history with the archæological discoveries that throw light on it. It has the advantage of including both Old and New Testaments in its scope, for, after giving an excellent up-to-date description of the geographical background, it deals with the subject from the earliest times to the final dispersion of the Jews in A.D. 135. There are chapters on the early stories of Genesis, the Patriarchal narratives, the Conquest and settlement, the history of the monarchy, the post-exilic reconstruction, and the conditions under Roman rule. All throughout the book, the setting of the story is vividly portrayed in the light of modern research, while the concluding chapter gives an account of the various attempts, including the present one, to re-establish the Jews in Palestine. The author will not carry all scholars with him in his advocacy of the theory of a late exodus in the thirteenth century B.C., in the beginning of the reign of Merenptah. His presentation of the reasons which are supposed to uphold this view has nothing new in it. The fact that there is no agreement between the names in the Biblical record and those in the Amarna Letters is of no consequence, for the date of Abdi-Hiba's Letters, referring to the threatened attack on Jerusalem (cf. Jg 1[8]), is not that of Joshua so much as that of his immediate successors, about which the Biblical record is almost silent. There was abundance of time for the rulers of Jerusalem and of other cities to have changed frequently between the entry of the Israelites (*c.* 1405 B.C.) and the time of the Jerusalem tablets, which are placed by Knudtzon from 1385 B.C. downwards. The old arguments, too, which are here brought forward afresh, based on the advent of the Philistines, the use of iron, and the number of kings who ruled over Edom, are known by many Old Testament scholars to have little or nothing in their favour, especially in view of the ever-increasing evidence regarding the earlier date. Nor will all scholars agree that the distinguishing physical traits of the Jewish race, so different from those of the Arabs, came from the Hittites or Indo-Europeans of Anatolia. It is more probable that they are due to the admixture with the Hurrian race in northern Mesopotamia. There is a tendency in the volume to trace the narrative portions of the Old Testament to mere oral tradition, to the exclusion of written records. The oral element is certainly a large one, but the constant discoveries now being made that writing was well developed as early as the second millennium B.C. go to show that written sources, now unknown to us, must be given a larger place. Many scholars will welcome the author's criticism of the documentary theory, and favour the substitution of a stratum theory for it. 'The analysis of the text,' he says, 'into minute component parts is becoming so detailed, and the number of the documents that have to be presupposed, in order to account for these component parts, is increasing in such a way that the theory is becoming untenable.'

The volume is undoubtedly a most useful addition to the historical and archæological literature on the Old Testament. It has maps and numerous plates, as well as a bibliography and an excellent index. It should prove of value not only to Biblical students, but to the increasing number of people who are interested in modern discoveries in Palestine.

THE ETERNAL GOSPEL.

The Eternal Gospel, by Rufus M. Jones, D.D. (Macmillan; 8s. 6d. net), is the first volume of a new series on 'The Great Issues of Life.' The writer is an acknowledged authority on the mystic type of religion and his theological position is very generally known, so that his name on the title page will secure for the volume a cordial reception. It should, however, be said that the title may seem somewhat misleading to many readers. It covers a far wider field than what is generally understood by the gospel. 'The Eternal Gospel as I shall interpret it is the endless revelation to men of a spiritual Reality who is over all and in all, and at the same time vastly more than all things in space and time, a Reality both immanent and transcendent, as Spirit in its essential nature is bound to be.' In accordance with this definition the writer treats not merely of revelation through history and supremely in Christ, but also of revelation through literature, through the mystics, and through the great philosophers. The concluding chapter on Equinoxes of the Spirit deals with various epochs, beginning with the era of Buddha, Confucius, and the Greek philosophers, when the human spirit appears to have had special blossoming times under the influence of some divine afflatus. The general thesis of the book is that 'God must not be looked for primarily in the mysterious gaps in our knowledge of beginnings and endings, of missing links, or in lost clues to the meaning of odd occurrences. He must be sought rather as the intelligible ground and basis of coherence and order in the mighty frame and constitution of things, of truth and beauty and goodness wherever they appear, of process and progress in the march of life and history wherever process and progress are in evidence, and of the Procession of the holy Spirit in Love and Fellowship through personal lives and spiritual communions throughout the ages.'

THE OLD TESTAMENT AND MODERN DISCOVERY.

A successful first book may be a real danger to a writer, particularly if he has considerable ability without being able to claim specialist knowledge. In 'Bible and Spade' the Rev. Stephen L. Caiger did a very useful piece of work, and the volume commanded the respect and even the admiration of a very wide range of readers. The book had, naturally, weaknesses, but they were not sufficiently great to mar the general excellence of the whole. In his new book, *The Old Testament and Modern Discovery* (S.P.C.K.; paper 1s., cloth 1s. 9d.), the weaknesses are seriously exaggerated, and the virtues are far less in evidence. The plan of the work is, in itself, good; each field of exploration is taken separately and the discoveries made in it briefly described. There is little, however, which Mr. Caiger had not already given in his earlier book. We have a rather fuller account of the work of decipherment, and there are details in the Lachish Letters which were not available to the general public two years ago. But these slight advantages do not compensate for the grave misunderstandings to which this book would give rise if it were a reader's only guide. To take a historical point, Mr. Caiger still regards the battle of Karkar (853 B.C.) as an Assyrian victory. It is true that the city itself was destroyed—apparently before the battle was fought—but Shalmaneser would certainly have moved southwards if he had been successful, and the actual fall of Damascus would have taken place a dozen years earlier than it actually did. Moreover, the language the Assyrian king uses is that which Eastern records commonly employ to disguise a repulse. We still have an inability to distinguish between the facts which an archæologist discovers and the interpretation he gives to them. For instance, the great layer of clay found by Sir Leonard Woolley between two strata of occupation at Ur is still connected with the Flood. But surely the depositing of eight feet of alluvial soil by a 'flood,' however great, would be a far more startling miracle than any recorded in the Bible? Is it not much more probable that the river itself changed its course and flowed for many centuries over the old site? At times the book reads like propaganda; only those points which tend to 'confirm the truth of the Bible' are cited. Mr. Caiger emphasizes (quite rightly) the importance of Garstang's work at Jericho, but he is silent as to the archæological results of excavation at Ai, which, according to the best opinion available, was destroyed some two centuries after Jericho. No reader would guess from this book that the most serious attacks on the historicity of the Biblical narrative are coming to-day from the archæologist, or that one of the most distinguished of living workers in this field, though starting with a position which was almost Fundamentalist, is coming to the conclusion that the Hebrew records are quite unreliable.

Mr. Caiger has a real gift for putting his facts in a popular way (though he might use rather fewer exclamation marks), and could do very valuable service. But he should be much more sure of those facts than he is, and should take a far more comprehensive view of his subject. If he can do this, he will be the first to regret *The Old Testament and Modern Discovery.*

The Halley Stewart Lectures for 1937 are published under the title of *The World's Economic*

Future (Allen & Unwin; 4s. 6d. net). There are five lectures, each delivered by a distinguished economist. Needless to say, the lectures are highly informative and stimulating, but on the whole the reader is left with the impression that many questions are asked but few are answered. Perhaps there would be general agreement among the lecturers with the conclusion reached by Professor Ohlin: 'first, we need a system which provides means for central direction and control—*e.g.* to mitigate depressions, to check abuses, to finance technical research on a large scale, to avoid labour conflicts, to reduce risks of violent price fluctuations for agricultural products and raw materials, and so on; and secondly, this system must not be bureaucratic, as it will be if centralization is pursued beyond a certain point.' Señor Madariaga, who delivered the concluding lecture, is firm in his faith that humanity is an organism, that 'one and only one life runs through all the limbs, organs, tissues, classes, nations, races of mankind,' and 'that being so, all entities below the whole—*i.e.* below the World Commonwealth—are but limbs of it. If they want the whole to keep them alive, they must live for the whole. Men and nations must realize inwardly—not merely think and agree, but *digest* and live—the unity of all this vast body politic which is mankind.'

The religious aspects of Mr. J. A. Hobson's *Confessions of an Economic Heretic* (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net) have been dealt with in our 'Notes of Recent Exposition.' The book, however, is mainly devoted to tracing the development of the author's economic theory. It is a fascinating story. Briefly, the substance of it is that gradually, and under various influences, Mr. Hobson has, in economics and sociology, become more and more of a humanist. The ethical has gradually invaded his entire outlook. He has always been a suggestive and (in the literal sense) edifying thinker. In this book he is persuasive, and, in many ways, convincing. He would probably be repudiated by all parties, for, if he is not a capitalist, he is not by any means a complete socialist. He occupies a middle position, and, though some of his tenets may appear impracticable, they are inspired by a spirit and ideal that, in spite of himself, may well be called Christian. The main *theme* of this book is economics, but its main *interest* lies in the frank account of the personal development of an able and sincere thinker, who has much to say of politics and parties and interests and obligations that we ought all to hear.

A book of prayers that is inspired by the desire to see daily service conducted in every congregation of the Church of Scotland has been compiled by the Rev. J. G. Grant Fleming, D.S.O., M.C., M.A., Minister of the East Church of St. Nicholas, Aberdeen—*Prayers for Every Day* (*Sundays and Week-days throughout the Christian Year*) (Allenson; 6s. net). It is a remarkable fact that a week-day service has been carried on in the East Church of St. Nicholas in Aberdeen with almost unbroken continuity since the Reformation of 1560. The prayers used at this service to-day have been mainly composed or collected by Mr. Fleming himself, and the detailed acknowledgments at the end of the book show how catholic are the sources on which he has drawn. It is superfluous to praise a book like this. But it is a duty to point out the immense labour that has gone to its compilation, and also the fine taste that is shown in the choice of the devotions which the writer has selected. The book will be of immense help to all ministers of churches where there is no liturgy, whether as material for public worship, or as inspiration for the officiating minister himself. The desire for dignity and order in divine service, as well as simplicity and spirituality, has been steadily increasing in non-liturgical churches, and Mr. Fleming's book will do much to inform and guide this feeling.

Among the latest productions of Haverford College, Old Testament scholars will welcome *The Haverford Symposium on Archæology and the Bible* (American Schools of Oriental Research, New Haven; $2.00), containing articles by W. F. Albright, George A. Barton, Henry J. Cadbury, John W. Flight, Albrecht Goetze, Theophile J. Meek, James A. Montgomery, John A. Wilson, and Elihu Grant (the editor). It is gratifying that the teaching given to the Haverfordians in the languages, history, and criticism of the Bible is being made available to others in these 'Biblical and Kindred Studies,' of which the present volume forms No. 6. The articles, it need hardly be said, being thoroughly up-to-date and by specialists in their subject, are of great importance for all Biblical study. They deal with Syro-Palestinian, Anatolian, Hittite, Mesopotamian, Arabian, and Egyptian studies, as well as with the history of writing in the Near East, and the present state of Biblical research. A supplement, with text and plates, illustrates ancient Babylonian business about 2000 B.C. The information given in the articles, notes at the end of each of them, and the scholarship manifest on every page, make the book a valuable one that should occupy a prominent place in the library of every teacher, student, and Biblical archæologist.

It is probable that comparatively few people read the prophets with much understanding. This is due partly to the arrangement of our Bible in sections that separate the prophets from the history. If, for example, it was clear that the 30th chapter of Isaiah was a speech on foreign policy, dealing with the fatal decision of the King of Judah to take sides with Egypt against Assyria, the chapter would be both interesting and full of significance for the present European situation. Mr. R. Barclay Moon, in *Stories of the Prophets as told to their Friends* (Cokesbury Press, Nashville; $1.25), tries to sketch the background of eight Old Testament prophets. Having done this he gives an imaginary sketch of the prophet's life, using, as far as possible, Biblical material, and quoting freely from the prophet's writings. We are rather tired of 'imaginary' Bible sketches, but there is a good deal to be said for this one, and certainly the author succeeds in his main purpose, which is to make the prophets real and their works intelligible.

An American edition of *Son to Susanna*, by G. Elsie Harrison (Cokesbury Press, Nashville; $2.50)—already reviewed in The Expository Times—has been received. It is fitting that in this beautiful form this impressionist but penetrating sketch of Wesley's domestic life should be made available for readers in the West, who will doubtless agree with the verdict that 'there is nothing at all like it in Wesley literature.'

The revival of interest in the writings of Thomas Aquinas is very marked both within the Roman Catholic Church and beyond it. *Morals Makyth Man*, by Mr. Gerald Vann, O.P. (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net), is an exposition of the Thomist system in its bearings upon the problems of to-day. The book falls into two parts. In the first there is given an able presentation of the Thomist moral theory, which is summarized thus: 'St Thomas's moral doctrine does not aim at the niggardly ordering of the individual's conduct in blind obedience to a code. It is a cosmic scheme; its end is God's glory and the *ordo universi*, the fulfilment of the world. It is not solely self-love, however sublime; it is not merely altruism, however grand; it is not merely obedience to a law; it is not the service, however disinterested, of an impersonal absolute, nor obedience to a capricious God—it is the communal striving, motived by the love which is, as St. Thomas says, *congregativus*, not, like selfishness, *disgregativus*, after the life of God, the *interminabilis vitae tota simul et perfecta possessio*, of which the presence and companionship of the first love is the essence.' The second part of the book contains eight 'essays in application,' in which such topics are dealt with as Politics and the Thomist Order, the Economics of Personality, Christian Marriage, Thomism, and Peace. On each of these topics a great deal of sound moral teaching is given, but, while it is wholesomely Christian, there seems to be no reason why it should be regarded as specifically Thomist.

A Modern Introduction to the New Testament, by Mr. Guy Kendall, formerly headmaster of University College School, Hampstead (Methuen; 7s. 6d. net), is a rather strange title, for all contemporary 'introductions' are modern. Possibly the author meant to imply 'modernist,' and this would be a correct description of its tendency. There is sound scholarship in the book. The writer has read widely in the relative literature, and has in particular received a good deal of teaching from the 'Form' critics. Moreover, every problem of New Testament criticism is thoroughly discussed, and even questions of interpretation and points of theology are included in the writer's survey. How wide is his net may be indicated by the headings of some of his chapters: Contemporary Politics; Miracles in the New Testament; The Organization of the Early Church; Justification by Faith or by Works?; Mysteries, Sacraments, Theosophy; The Meaning of Sacrifice. In addition, of course, he discusses the individual books.

There is one feature of the book which to many readers will be unsatisfactory. They will ask from such a book some basis of confidence in the historical ground of Christian belief. And they will ask in this case without much result. 'Probably,' 'possibly,' 'it is uncertain,' are, as the writer admits, phrases of frequent occurrence. Even on such a crucial matter as the Resurrection of Jesus we are left in the air. And the concluding chapter, in which the author sums up, is quite inconclusive as to what really happened and what ground we have for assurance about the facts of the New Testament record. The writer says this is 'the necessary consequence of the historical method.' But if that be so, history is not very friendly to faith. At the same time it ought to be said that the writer scrupulously presents both sides of every question, that he has thought out the issue for himself, and that 'probably' it is his desire to be quite fair and honest that leaves him (and us) rather on the fence.

A most helpful and sincere book about prayer, taking the form of an exposition of the Lord's Prayer, has been written by a schoolmaster who has already contributed in various ways to the religious education of youth—*Our Father: A Book about Praying*, by Mr. George Snow (S.P.C.K.; 2s. net). There is a simplicity about the writing that is charming, but the book is full of careful thinking and rich experience. It would be an excellent book to put into the hands of a boy or girl who is beginning to explore things.

Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley has added another—*Ancient Hebrew Poems* (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net)—to the long list of books with which he has enriched our knowledge and appreciation of the Old Testament. His new work is a selection of thirty-two pieces taken from the poetical sections of the Bible. The last three are from books of the Apocrypha which were originally written in Hebrew, though, in two cases, only the Greek has survived. Among the rest we have a number of the poems now included in the historical books, three psalms, no less than eleven pieces from the Book of Isaiah (including the four 'Servant Songs'), pieces from other prophetic books, from Tobit, from Judith, and from Ecclesiasticus. To each is prefixed a short introduction; then follows an original rendering of the poem, after which come notes, mainly textual. The translations are skilfully arranged to show the metrical form, and the reader who wishes to get some idea of the rhythm of Hebrew poetry will find guidance in the accents placed over the significant words in each line. A general introduction gives a statement of the essential principles on which Hebrew poetic form is based.

It is inevitable that in such a book as this there should be some material on which differences of opinion are possible. Some students of Hebrew poetic form would make rather more use of parallelism in explaining metrical forms than Dr. Oesterley appears to do. Others might question the poetic nature of Jotham's parable and of Nathan's. There is, as yet, no agreement as to the amount of conjectural emendation required, and as to the exact form of emendation when a change is clearly inevitable. There is hardly one among the poems chosen on which some question might not arise, perhaps more in the 'Servant Songs' than anywhere else. But Dr. Oesterley's profound scholarship will give the reader confidence in his judgment; the short introductions are clear and admirable presentations of the nature of each piece and of the conditions (so far as they can be ascertained) in which it was composed, while not a few readers will gain fresh insight into the music and stately beauty of these old Hebrew poems.

Familiar as we are with controversy over the higher criticism we have forgotten that in former times controversy was equally bitter over the lower criticism. Collation of manuscripts and publication of variant readings were regarded with suspicion as unsettling to Christian minds and subversive of faith. This is strikingly exemplified in an admirable life of one of the greatest of New Testament scholars, *John James Wettstein, 1693–1754*, by Mr. C. L. Hulbert-Powell, M.A. (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net). It is surprising that no adequate biography has before appeared in English of one whose work in the field of New Testament criticism has placed all subsequent scholars in his debt. Born in Basel of distinguished family Wettstein early made his mark as a student of New Testament literature, a painstaking collator of manuscripts, and a profoundly erudite scholar. He, however, became the victim of a bitter heresy hunt which drove him from Basel to Amsterdam where he ended his days. The writer of this biography has devoted immense time and care to his work, and the result is in the highest degree praiseworthy. A valuable summary is given of Wettstein's Prolegomena, as also a full account of his edition of the New Testament which is likely soon to be reissued. An interesting parallel is drawn between Wettstein and Robertson Smith in their characters and experiences, but it is pointed out that 'the striking difference lies in the fact that Robertson Smith was an orthodox Evangelical to the end of his too short life, whereas Wettstein was certainly, in spite of his too frequent protests, nothing of the kind.'

◆

The Factor of Testimony in the Gospels.

By the Reverend Professor Allan Barr, M.A., United Free Church of Scotland Theological College, Edinburgh.

Source criticism of the Gospels has established the fact that within forty years or so of the death of Jesus two main sources of our Synoptic Gospels (Mark and Q) had taken shape as writings in Greek. Unsatisfied with the uncertain traditions which point to an Apostolic authority for these records, critics in recent years have sought to pass beyond this delimitation of sources to an analysis and evaluation of the component material. The *formgeschichtliche* scholars, using methods that are not new but are applied by them with great thoroughness to the task, make a minute classification of the material of which the Gospels are composed, compare it with analogous material drawn from Rabbinical and Classical literature, seek to disentangle the modifications made upon the tradition at various stages of its transmission, and so aim at presenting a coherent account of the development of the tradition from the time of Jesus' life to its deposit in written form in our Gospels. In this method of study great stress is laid upon the interests and needs of the Early Church. Wherever an element is found in the Gospel records which corresponds to some dogmatic, ecclesiastical, or practical interest of the Church, it has to be regarded as an accretion. On the removal of all such elements, a residue remains which has an indefinite claim to historical value in relation to the actual events of Jesus' life. The results would be more convincing if our knowledge of the first-century Christian communities were more complete. And it is one of the dangers of the method that an important interest of the Early Church—and even a fairly obvious one—may be overlooked or given less than its due weight by the investigator. The aim of this article is to draw attention to a rather neglected factor in the Gospel tradition which at the present time acquires considerable importance in view of *formgeschichtliche* and other criticism.

The crucial question is the relation of the Gospel traditions to the original eye-witnesses. It is a question that seems generally to be set aside as if any attempts to answer it must be mere conjectures. Or worse—the existence of the question may be simply ignored. Dr. Vincent Taylor, in his sympathetic study of *formgeschichtliche* criticism, says: 'It is on this question of eye-witnesses that Form-Criticism presents a very vulnerable front. If the Form-Critics are right, the disciples must have been translated to heaven immediately after the Resurrection.'[1] It is the aim of the present article to pass beyond the assertion of the probability that our earliest sources were influenced by surviving witnesses to the consideration of certain positive, though chiefly indirect, indications that an important and on the whole a controlling factor in the formation of the Gospels was the interest of the early Christians in the veracity, as judged by contemporary standards of evidence, of their information regarding Jesus.

If the Christians had a real interest in the accuracy of their traditions, they must have tested them by their own standards of evidence. Now it need hardly be said that we cannot expect these to be the standards of the modern historian. The impartial criticism of sources, the weighing of probabilities, the sifting and appraising of indirect evidence, were beyond the range of the early Christians and their contemporaries. Where, then, could men of the time and cultural level of the early Christians find standards to verify the facts reported to them, if so they wished to do? The answer is simply this—in the principle of corroboration by eye-witnesses. The classical expression of the principle is Dt 19[15], 'At the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses, shall the matter be established' (cf. Dt 17[6]). This is, of course, in the first place, a principle applicable to courts of law, and in the context of Deuteronomy it is connected with charges of grievous crime (conceived of course as iniquity, sin). But there are many indications that the principle spread over a much wider field of judgment, and became an element in the general outlook of the circles with which we are concerned. Two instances from the New Testament will show how close to the surface of men's thinking this principle lay. In Mt 18[15ff.] these words occur: 'Moreover, if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established.' The two or three witnesses are not called in to substantiate any charge, but by their presence to assist in bringing about confession and reconciliation. Yet the mention of 'two or three' is sufficient to bring the Deuteronomic text to the Evangelist's mind. (As v.[17] shows, it is a passage in which the interests of the Church if not of the Evangelist himself find expression.) A still clearer example of the extension of the principle is found in 2 Co 13[1] where Paul writes: 'This is the third time I am coming to you. In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established.' To which of us, writing to-day with similar circumstances in view, would the reference to two or three witnesses occur?

---

[1] *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition*, 41.

The principle of corroboration of testimony in the legal sphere is so elementary and so universal in its application, wherever a vestige of justice remains, that it may seem unpromising as a means of differentiating between the outlook of men of ancient and modern times. But there are several considerations that point to its deeper influence in ancient times and especially among the Jews. For the Jew all life was regulated by Torah, and a principle enunciated in the Pentateuch was bound to be applied in every possible direction. Again, the provisions of the Law itself made witness-bearing a highly responsible duty. False witness was met with drastic punishments (*e.g.* Dt 19[16ff.]). In criminal cases the witnesses initiated the prosecution and on capital charges carried out the execution (Dt 17[7], cf. Sanhedrin VI. 4). The administration of justice was carried out before the eyes of all, and in the relatively simple social life of Palestine, interest in the courts and their procedure would be general. In one passage of the Mishnah (Rosh ha-Shanah, 1, 2), where discussion is recorded about the conditions and validity of testimony as to the appearing of the new moon at the beginning of the year, a vivid impression is conveyed of the place of testimony in the ordinary life of the people. Witnesses of the appearance of the first slip of the moon hurried in pairs to the Sanhedrin in Jerusalem to report the fact. More than forty pairs of witnesses are said to have arrived on one occasion before the signal that the new year had indeed begun could be sent out. In modern life, the testimony of the plain man who can say, 'This I saw,' 'This I heard,' does not always go so far. We leave the new moons to the astronomers. It is true that in our law courts questions of fact are still put to a jury of honest citizens, and corroboration of evidence is still theoretically required. But we all know how far expert opinion has come in to take the place of the plain man's evidence of things seen and heard. The post-mortem examination, the finger-print, take the place of many witnesses. On our general life, too, with its complexity of interests, and on our ways of thinking, judicial procedure has less bearing; our lot is cast far from those who saw every case tried out before the wise men at the city gate. And if there are some in our day who have advanced to scientific and more discriminating criteria of evidence, there are others who are content to have fallen back into that worse state in which they judge a question of fact not by scientific method, nor yet by the witness of their fellows, but by its bearing on their own loyalties and prejudices.

In some respects Græco-Roman life is nearer to our own than is the Jewish, and it is an interesting question whether, if the factor of testimony had a part in the shaping of the original Gospel tradition, the wider influences of Græco-Roman literature and life may not have intervened adversely at a later stage. The Gospels come to us from the Greek-speaking world, and we have in Luke a representative of that wider world, working upon the traditions at the last stage of the period we have under study. Luke's handling of Mark will throw light upon this point.

In the Fourth Gospel there are some direct references to testimony which will interest us later, but in the Synoptics such references are few, and we must have recourse to an indirect way of approaching the question. We review the characteristics of the Synoptic Gospels, on the formal side, and seek an explanation of their style and method. Our thesis is that the facts relating to the form of the Gospels admit of no better explanation than this, that the Christians who first transmitted the tradition and those who later preserved it sought to present the acts and words of Jesus as reported by those who saw and heard them, with an emphasis on the memorable and verifiable things in the events narrated. There is implied a conscientious purpose among the Christians at an early stage to take the story from the mouths of eye-witnesses, and at a later stage, when few of the original witnesses were available, to place credence on such earlier records as seemed to have been thus substantiated.

It is in the narrative portions of the Gospels that we find the most fruitful field for this review. Epithets may be lavished on the narrative style of the Synoptic Gospels. It is simple, clear, vivid, life-like, and so on. But for a full understanding of its significance we must not be content with noting such characteristics from a literary point of view. Every feature of these narratives has its explanation in the outlook, aims, and standards of the narrators. And there may be something there that the prevalent Form-Criticism of to-day has overlooked and left unexplained.

The Gospels on the whole are marked by a great economy of words. Since they were written few expositors and preachers have been satisfied with them; they miss out so many of the things in which people are most interested. In particular, two interests are commonly missing. For one, we may employ the elastic term 'romantic.' It is the interest of the spectator of life's changes and adventures. It delights to dwell upon the exploits of heroic figures. Its curiosity and love of variety find expression in expansive narrative and fullness of description. It is the parent of legend and of the modern novel. Closely allied to it is another interest largely absent from the Synoptic narratives. It is the psychological interest, by which we mean, not of course the interest of the trained psychologist, but that interest in the inner life of thought, will, and feeling as introspection reveals it, with its moods and strains and conflicts and its interplay with circumstance. There is, of course, in the Synoptic narratives a real interest in character, but it is character as revealed in action. There are emotions, but they are of the kind that show themselves at the outside of a man—anger, and fear, and pity. Often it is not the emotion in itself but what it makes a man do that is recorded. The high priest rent his clothes. Peter went out and wept bitterly (Mk 14^{63}, Mt 26^{75}). With the lack of the romantic and psychological interests the elements of biography as the modern mind conceives it are missing. It is not the purpose of the Evangelists to write the life of Jesus.

On the positive side we find a concentration, a focusing of light upon sayings and events associated with them. It is remarkable how often we find that even where Matthew and Luke are using some freedom with a section of Mark, all three Gospels come together in the sayings recorded (*e.g.* Mk 2^{1-22}). This is true not only of the brief sections which culminate in a saying of Jesus (*Apophthegmata*, *Paradigmen*, Pronouncement-Stories), but even of the healing miracles and the Nature miracles too. 'Stretch forth thy hand.' 'Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole.' 'She is not dead, but sleepeth.' 'Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid.' Nor is the correspondence confined to the words of Jesus Himself. 'Master, we perish.' 'Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean.'

We have, in short, to find an explanation of the Evangelists' work which will account for the comparative absence of romantic and psychological elements, the sparseness of descriptive touches, the concentration upon the striking action and the memorable word. It is no explanation to speak of 'the popular style' of the narratives, nor to think of these as the features of some merely literary convention or habit. The explanation is to be found in the outlook of the Evangelists and their predecessors, in their interests, aims, beliefs, and standards. Does any explanation better fit the facts than that the tradition is shaped and preserved by attention to the things to which men who saw and heard them could testify?

Such, generally, is the style of Mark's narrative. Yet in Mark there are not lacking some passages in which the romantic interest appears. It is of great interest to note how Matthew and Luke deal with these passages. A conspicuous example is Mark's account of the death of John the Baptist (6^{17-29}). The death of John is relevant to the Gospel theme, but the birthday feast of Antipas and the dancing of Herodias' daughter—however fine a story they make—belong to the region of romance. Matthew reduces the section to about a half of Mark's, and Luke omits it altogether. Throughout Mark there are many minor descriptive touches which are omitted by one or both of the other Evangelists. Their pruning of Mark is by no means confined to the removal of linguistic roughnesses or of expressions that might be regarded as lacking in reverence for the Master.[1] This fact is specially significant in the case of Luke. Mark's description of the Storm and of Jesus' stilling of it occupies only a few verses. Yet this is too long for Luke, who cuts out several phrases, including the reference to Jesus sleeping in the stern upon a pillow (Mk 4^{38}, Lk 8^{23}). And this economy is from the hand of the author who writes or at least includes in Acts that other account of a sea-storm, filling column after column of his papyrus with his tempest called Euraquilo, the securing of the boat, the undergirding of the ship, the casting overboard of cargo and tackle, and all the rest (Ac 27). Or take the narrative of the bringing of children to Jesus. Mark after relating the saying of Jesus, 'Suffer the little children to come into me and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God,' adds that

---

[1] *E.g.* Mk 10^{21}, ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ ἠγάπησεν αὐτὸν καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ.
Mt 19^{21}, ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς.
Lk 18^{22}, ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ.

Jesus took them up in His arms, put His hands upon them, and blessed them (10^{16}, cf. Mt 19^{15}, Lk 18^{17}). Matthew abbreviates the passage. But why does Luke completely omit that final sentence? None of the Evangelists is more sensitive to the tender and beautiful elements in Jesus' ministry. Under what severe inhibitive principle is he working that he considers such words superfluous?

Because Matthew and Luke contain a number of sections of a late and secondary character (*e.g.* the accounts of the end of Judas and the guard at the Tomb in Matthew), it seems often to be hastily inferred that they stand midway in a process of development or deterioration from Mark to the unhistorical Apocryphal Gospels and later legends. As regards the major part of Matthew and Luke this view may be shown to be quite erroneous. The use of proper names provides a test. In the legendary literature names are found for many of the minor characters of the Gospel story—Veronica; Dysmas and Gestas, the crucified thieves; Petronius, the centurion; and so on. Attention has frequently been drawn to what are regarded as the beginnings of this tendency in the canonical Gospels. The two disciples who in Mark's account are sent on to prepare the Passover appear as Peter and John in Luke (22^{8}). The unnamed follower who uses his sword in the Garden, and the unnamed servant whose ear he cuts off become Peter and Malchus in the Fourth Gospel (Jn 18^{10}). But such cases are rare in the Synoptic Gospels and are more than balanced by changes in the very opposite direction. Mark alone gives the name of Bartimæus (10^{46}). Mark alone mentions the sons of Simon of Cyrene (15^{21}). Most instructive are the cases in which Peter, James, and John are named in the Marcan account as accompanying Jesus on certain great occasions. Only in the Transfiguration narrative do both Matthew and Luke retain the names (Mk 9^{2}, Mt 17^{1}, Lk 9^{28}). In the account of the raising of Jairus' daughter (Mk 5^{37}, Mt $9^{18.\,23}$, Lk 8^{51}) Matthew omits the names of the three disciples, and he also omits the name of Jairus. Both Matthew and Luke pass over Mark's mention of the age of the girl (5^{42}). In the Gethsemane narrative Luke, unlike Mark and Matthew, does not mention the three disciples who advance into the Garden with Jesus (Mk 14^{33}, Mt 26^{37}, Lk 22^{41}). Further, at the healing of Peter's mother-in-law, while Mark relates that Jesus entered into the house of Simon *and Andrew with James and John*, Matthew and Luke are content to state that He entered the house of Simon (Peter) (Mk 1^{29}, Mt 8^{14}, Lk 4^{38}). How far we are from legend when the experiences of the greatest Apostles can be so passed over! The fact is that there are two reasons for the inclusion of names in the tradition as it develops—the one is proximity to the actual events, and the other is distance from them! If we imagine ourselves in Galilee on the day after Jesus healed the paralytic, we will realize that every one in town and countryside would have upon his lips the names not only of Jesus, but of the invalid and the men who bore him, the master of the house, and many more. At a later stage, to which much of the material of the Synoptic Gospels belongs, only a few of the names would be remembered. When the narrative becomes legendary, fictitious names will be invented.

There is indeed a presumption that, at the stage of the tradition represented by Mark, the names of subordinate characters indicate either witnesses of the events or the Evangelist's informants. This is certainly the case with Alexander and Rufus, sons of Simon who carried the Cross (Mk 15^{21}). They seem to have been better known than their father to Mark and his circle of readers. To Matthew and Luke, it is likely, they were unknown, and their names disappear from their accounts. It is an attractive suggestion that it is primarily as witnesses that Peter, James, and John are mentioned in the passages we have been considering. And, if it is so, can we venture to date the shaping of these stories before the year A.D. 44, when James was put to death by Herod Agrippa (Ac 12^{2})? When Matthew and Luke come to write, the direct testimony of the witnesses is no longer available, and, on the other hand, the legendary influence is not strong enough with the Evangelists to preserve in every case the names even of the great Apostles. In the place of the witnesses they rely upon Mark, pruning his narrative in many passages of those things that one man might observe and another miss, and fastening upon the things that all who witnessed them would remember and recall. In view of these methods, can we doubt that they relied upon Mark because on their standards of veracity they had reason to think him worthy of their trust? We cannot too often return to the statement of Luke himself (Lk $1^{1\text{-}4}$). The tradition that he records is that which has been handed down by those who were originally witnesses and later became the ministers of the Word. He has himself traced the course of events accurately from the first, and he writes to assure the reader of the certainty (ἀσφάλειαν) of the things he has been taught.

It may be objected that the vivid style of the

Synoptic narratives, which move around the dramatic act and the memorable word, might be paralleled by examples taken from ancient literature and particularly from the Old Testament, where a whole narrative may be judged unhistorical, or where events are described at such a distance from the writer's time that it is inconceivable that the narrative owes anything to the original participants in the events. Yet it would be difficult to find examples where writers handle events, conceived by them as of supreme and world-shaking importance, with the succinctness and economy so generally met with in the Synoptic Gospels. And besides, it is not merely these characteristics in themselves, but the combination of these characteristics with the historical situation of the writers that gives to our argument any force it may have. Writers of the outlook of our Evangelists, if they are set the task of reconstructing some scene of the distant past, will describe it with the same objective realism as they bring to bear on recent events. But for the Synoptic narratives we have to reckon with the proximity of witnesses. For our earliest forms of the tradition, the standards of objective realism which they exhibit cannot be reconciled with a supposed indifference to testimony still actually available, and the later forms of the Synoptic tradition, still controlled by these standards, are close enough to the events for the reliability of their sources to have been ascertained by the Evangelists.

In a thorough review of our subject we would be led on to consider the bearing of the factor of testimony on the scheme, as distinguished from the material, of Mark's Gospel, and on the historical value of Q and the special material of Matthew and Luke. We would have to study the deviation from the standards of realism outlined above in certain passages which have a legendary colour, and in the birth-narratives, particularly of Luke. We would have also to consider whether other interests, particularly that in the fulfilment of prophecy, have at any points usurped the place of testimony and taken control of the narrative. But we must pass on to some remarks on the limitations which the Synoptic standards of realism, as we have outlined them, place upon the Evangelists, and then to a brief consideration of the Fourth Gospel. The method of the Synoptic writers does not produce history or biography as we understand them, and we must accept these limitations. Nor can we expect that it has produced a record of infallible accuracy even on the level of its own standards. The witnesses were not cross-examined in a court of law. These standards are even compatible with a certain degree of credulity. While the modern mind will sometimes refuse the evidence of its own eyes till some explanation—however superficial—of what it sees is offered, the mind that judges facts on testimony may accept what a little reasoning would modify or reject. What we are entitled to have, if the Evangelists really adhered to such standards of realism, is a confidence both in their *bona fides* and in the general reliability of the records they have bequeathed to us.

There is a further limitation to which writers are liable whose realism centres upon the revealing act and the memorable saying. Their method is not adequate to the portrayal of the inner life, except where it reveals itself in action, and the region of the soul's doubts and strivings, its yearnings, and hopes and joys can be explored only as it were by searchlight. Three times in Acts ($9^{1\mathrm{ff.}}$ $22^{4\mathrm{ff.}}$ $26^{9\mathrm{ff.}}$) a dramatic account of Paul's conversion is given; yet for the inner meaning of that great event how much more we gather from an incidental word of the Apostle himself—'When it pleased God . . . to reveal his Son in me. . . .' (Gal $1^{15.\,16}$). The prayer life of Jesus interests the Synoptic Evangelists. But it is a great tribute to their adherence to objective standards that they give no report of it except in so far as men were permitted to share in it. Even in Gethsemane it should be understood that a few disciples heard the prayer recorded, before sleep overcame them. Jesus advanced 'a little' ('about a stone's throw,' says Luke) and prayed (Mk 14^{35}, Mt 26^{39}, Lk 22^{41}). This limitation, due to the Synoptists' outlook and methods, has sometimes a curious result. When they have to deal with a scene of great spiritual intensity, where their instruments of description are inadequate for the task, they may seek to express that intensity by underlining and stressing its objective and material manifestation until the method overreaches itself and an appearance of materialism is given to the narrative. This, it may be suggested, is the case in certain difficult passages of Luke. If we accept the Western text in Luke's account of Gethsemane, sweat as it were great drops of blood fell from the Master in the agony of prayer. Here the other two Gospels express the intensity of the scene by the triple withdrawal for prayer (Lk 22^{44}, Mk $14^{35\mathrm{ff.}}$, Mt $26^{39\mathrm{ff.}}$). At the scene of Jesus' baptism, where the Spirit descends as a dove upon Him, Luke adds the words 'in bodily form' (Lk 3^{22}). If our view is correct this is not a case of his interference with his sources so much as his way of asserting his conviction that he is describing what we would call an 'objective' event or experience. Similarly in the account of Pentecost in Ac 2 it may be suggested that the writer, familiar in his own day with the manifestations of the Spirit's power, including the gift of tongues, in the Church, but convinced that the original descent of the Spirit was marked by greater power and intensity than any similar experience of a later time, so stresses the objectivity of the Pentecostal experience that it becomes almost incredible if too literal an interpretation is taken of it. And it may be also that the so-called materialistic features of Luke's Resurrection narrative, the flesh and bones of the Risen One, the broiled fish and the honeycomb, and so on, are essentially the expression in terms of objective realism of the Evangelist's assurance that 'the Lord is risen indeed' (Lk $24^{34.\ 39-43}$).

In the Fourth Evangelist we have a writer whose standards are of a different kind. There is no obstacle in his methods to the portrayal of inner, spiritual experience. Meditation and prayer and mystic fellowship find here their fitting instrument of expression. No longer does the truth which Jesus brings flash out from the diamond-jets of the solitary sentence. Whatever basis there may be for the Johannine discourses in the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus, the Evangelist no longer stands apart from his material, but taking it into his own hands and fitting it for his purpose presents a portrait of Jesus that is not the less impressive because the artist's soul also is revealed in it.

It is therefore doubly interesting and instructive to find in the Fourth Gospel so many explicit references to that factor of testimony which we have found implicitly formative in the Synoptics. The words μαρτυρέω and μαρτυρία are among the keywords of the Fourth Gospel. They are interwoven with the high doctrine of the Prologue. They occur frequently both in the narratives and the discourses throughout the Gospel. Jesus' mission itself is essentially witness-bearing (Jn 18^{37}). And the influence of the idea of testimony may be traced even where it is not explicitly expressed.

In a few passages of the Gospel appears one who is described as 'the disciple whom Jesus loved.' If we approach the Gospel with the testimony-interest in view, these passages take on a decidedly apologetic colour. In the first chapter an unnamed disciple—perhaps he who is afterwards to be called the 'beloved' one—stands with Andrew and hears John the Baptist declare of Jesus, 'Behold the Lamb of God!' ($1^{35\text{ff.}}$). It is clear from all our Gospels that the relation of John to Jesus was a burning question for the early Christians. Here Andrew is the primary witness to John's confession. The other is a sort of lay figure who stands in the background, but whose presence has the effect of making John's confession a public one. Andrew's witness on the matter is known, and it can be corroborated. The first definite mention of the Beloved Disciple is at the Last Supper ($13^{18\text{ff.}}$). Here he plays a part of the highest apologetic interest to the Evangelist and his readers. The fact that Jesus had harboured among the Twelve one who was to be His betrayer evidently would provide a lever for the detractions of opponents and would present a real difficulty to Christians themselves. The line of defence taken by the Fourth Evangelist is that it was with Jesus' knowledge and almost at His behest that the betrayer went about his nefarious work. Already in ch. 6 Jesus is reported as saying in response to Peter's confession, 'Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?' ($6^{66\text{ff.}}$). And now at the Supper the Beloved Disciple receives from the Master the unmistakable sign that He understands Judas and permits his treachery. Peter who observes the Master's sign at a farther distance is the corroborating witness. The Beloved Disciple appears again at the Cross, where Jesus commits His mother to him. When the death of Jesus and the piercing of His side have been described, it must be of this disciple that the Evangelist says, 'And he that saw it bare record (μεμαρτύρηκε, is the witness), and his record is true: and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe' (19^{35}). This is a much disputed verse, but it is clear that the Evangelist's standards of testimony have some bearing upon it. Probably it refers primarily to the event just recorded—the issue of blood and water from the pierced side of Jesus. What exactly the event signified for the Evangelist may not be clear to us. It is a reasonable suggestion which connects it with a view held in docetic circles of the personality as compounded of blood, water, and spirit (cf. 1 Jn $5^{6\text{ff.}}$). It is no phantom body from which the spirit of Jesus has departed. At any rate, the event is evidently a matter of supreme importance for the Evangelist. But he has only one witness for it. Hence the need for a special protestation of the truth of his testimony. The ἐκεῖνος of 'he knoweth that he saith true' may be God, or Christ, and one may find a parallel in the passages where Paul uses the phrase, 'God is my witness' when he is asserting some fact of his inner life for which his own word is naturally the only guarantee (Ro 1^{9}, 2 Co 1^{23}, Ph 1^{8}, 1 Th 2^{5}). Two comments on this verse may be made.

There is force in B. W. Bacon's remark,[1] in criticism of the view that the Evangelist himself is the witness here: 'Who ever heard of a writer employing such ambiguities to make the simple statement, "I myself saw this"?' And there remains some difficulty, though perhaps not so great a difficulty, in our understanding, with our stress on the factor of testimony, why the Evangelist, if he himself is the witness, should take this way of saying, 'I saw this. I cannot prove it, but I am telling the truth.' The other comment is this. It would have been a simple matter for the Evangelist, if he had been engaged upon a purely fictitious narrative, to introduce a second or half a dozen witnesses to support him at this point. The fact that he is at pains to protest the truthfulness of a single witness is a definite sign that he is working upon a historical basis. We need not discuss the similar protestation of truthfulness at the very end of the Gospel in the appended chapter, nor the appearance of the Beloved Disciple there. But a word must be said about the other passage in which the Beloved Disciple takes a prominent part. It is the account of the Empty Tomb, a passage clearly of great apologetic importance (20^{1-10}). Peter and the Beloved Disciple, hearing that the stone has been removed, hurry to the place. The other disciple outruns Peter, comes to the tomb, looks in and sees the grave-clothes. Peter arrives, passes him and enters the tomb. He is followed by the other. The tomb is empty, but the grave-clothes are folded in their places. The impression of corroboration is vividly given by the form of the narrative. This is not the evidence of one man and his shadow. There is no room for collusion, and each man's experience is a check upon the other's. Separately they come to the tomb, separately they enter. Peter cannot be responsible for the arrangement of the clothes, for the other disciple has seen them before Peter enters. The other disciple cannot have touched them, for he has not entered before Peter arrives.

The particular interpretation here suggested of these passages in their apologetic aspects need not be accepted, but they are offered as illustrating the fact that the idea of testimony is a formative factor in the narratives in which the Beloved Disciple figures. What we think of them historically may depend upon other considerations, but they at least reveal the standards according to which the Early Church was obliged to present the evidence for her historical claims over against the world's criticism and her own doubts.

When we pass to the other parts of the Gospel an important distinction has to be made. The testimony we have been considering has been testimony to fact. But there is another kind of testimony which involves value-judgment—a testimony not to the fact but to the truth. Now a question of fact may normally be decided at the mouth of two or three honest witnesses, but it is very clear to us that where æsthetic or moral values are involved the standard is inappropriate. We will not accept an opinion that a poem or a picture is beautiful, or that an action is good, simply because two people can be found to testify that it is so. Yet we find in the Fourth Gospel the simple principle of corroboration transferred to testimony of this kind. Such testimony is indeed impressive and convincing if we get enough of it, and get it from the right people; and one of the most impressive things in the Fourth Gospel is the accumulated testimony adduced for the greatest of Christian value-judgments, the supernatural endowment and Divine Sonship of Jesus. We get it (not the less telling because it is uttered in some cases without a full sense of its meaning) from the Baptist, 'Behold the Lamb of God!' ($1^{29.\ 36}$); from Nathanael, an Israelite indeed, 'Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the king of Israel' (1^{49}); from Nicodemus, 'Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God' (3^{2}); from the Samaritan woman, 'Is not this the Christ?' (4^{29}); from Peter, 'We believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Holy One of God' (6^{69}); from the people, 'When Christ cometh, will he do more miracles than these which this man hath done?' (7^{31}); from the officers, 'Never man spake like this man' (7^{46}); from Martha, 'Yea, Lord: I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world' (11^{27}); from Pilate, 'I find no fault in him' (19^{4}); and it culminates in the testimony of the doubting disciple, 'My Lord and my God' (20^{28}).

In the discourses the idea of testimony is frequently used, and it is in certain of these that a strain of artificiality comes into the Evangelist's presentation. In the dispute that follows the healing of the impotent man, Jesus says (5^{31-39}): 'If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true.[2] It is another that beareth witness of me; and I know that the witness which he witnesseth of me is true. Ye have sent unto John, and he hath borne witness unto the truth. But the witness which I receive is not from man . . . the witness which I have is greater than that of John: for the works which the Father hath given me to accomplish, the very works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me. And the Father which sent me, he hath borne witness of me. . . . Ye search the scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they which bear witness of me' (R.V.). In the controversy of ch. 8 (in vv.$^{13-19}$), the Pharisees say to Jesus, 'Thou bearest witness of thyself; thy witness is not true.'[1] Jesus answers, 'Even if I bear witness of myself, my witness is true; for I know whence I come and whither I go. . . . Yea and in your law it is written, that the witness of two men is true. I am he that beareth witness of myself, and the Father that sent me beareth witness of me. They said therefore to him, Where is thy Father?' (R.V.). Many readers will get the impression that in these passages the Evangelist has a greater message to deliver than he has succeeded in expressing. And the defect lies in his rather forced employment of the terms of fact-testimony for the expression of religious truth. This very artificiality, however, is of value for our present study. If the Fourth Evangelist, who has transcended the objective realism of the Synoptic tradition and has penetrated so deeply into the spiritual realities of the inner life, still freely employs the terms of fact-testimony, even where they are far from adequate for his purpose, is it not a remarkable tribute both to the Evangelist's respect for historical truth and to the historical standards of his original readers? There is here an indirect proof of the demand among Christians and their opponents for an objective and verifiable presentation of the historical foundation of Christian beliefs. Can we not assume that demand to have been a general one in the Christian communities, and if the Fourth Gospel itself does not fully satisfy it, can we not point to the Synoptic Gospels as exactly corresponding to what the answer to that need must have been?

---

[1] *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*, 459.

[2] Cf. *Kethuboth*, 2^{9}. *Rosh ha-Shanah*, 3^{1}.

---

[1] Cf. *Kethuboth*, 2^9. *Rosh ha-Shanah*, 3^1.

The Fight for Christianity in Germany.

Not even in the concentration camps do the opponents of the Christian Church in Germany have it all their own way. An imprisoned pastor was sitting quietly in his cell. Five S.S. men entered to 'beat him up.' 'But,' said the pastor, who told me the story, with a twinkle in his eye at this point, 'God had given our brother a gift for boxing, and he out-boxed all five!' The Church is sometimes militant and triumphant even in present-day Germany!

But to what extent may we expect the German Protestant Church to be really victorious, or even to hold its own in the existing struggle? That is a question which our German brethren themselves are answering differently. Sometimes I found confidence that the Christian faith, as surely as ever, had sufficient vitality to come through the present conflict with glory. At other times, my query about the future brought the reply, 'We do not know,' and the gravity with which it was given, and the noticeable tone of doubt, made one feel deeply unhappy.

At this stage of the fight, one fact is emerging with disconcerting clarity: the effort to win the Third Reich—especially its youth—for the doctrine of 'Blood and Soil' is proceeding with deliberation, so that Alfred Rosenberg receives increasing support from the National Socialist régime at the expense of the Christian teaching of the churches. Bookshops display his writings prominently; in Hitler Youth groups, work camps, S.A., S.S., and through Baldur von Shirach's bureau liberal doses of Rosenberg are administered. Rosenberg and the Minister for Church Affairs, Herr Kerrl, appear to be on terms of developing intimacy, and this association is sometimes reflected in Herr Kerrl's decisions on ecclesiastical matters. How, then, is the Church standing up to this onward march of politically backed paganism?

Apparently the Church is not the only centre of opposition. In the armed forces, for instance, there appear to be high officers who object to Rosenberg's 'Weltanschauung' from a military standpoint. The question is raised whether an army is ready for action unless inculcated with the more general truths of the Christian faith! Suppose the Nordic man in battle suffered reverses; suppose the conflict were prolonged and brought desperate strain—would the gospel of the superiority of German blood, and the inevitability of the German mission in history hold, and continue to buttress nerve and hope? It is feared that *The Myth of the Twentieth Century* is inadequate to maintain the morale of the soldier and of the civilian population through the agony of warfare.

But naturally the vanguard of the fight for Christianity must be taken by the Christian churches, and is being taken by them, but how are they faring?

Undoubtedly the brunt of the battle is being borne by the Confessional Church. In the eyes of the Government this is the crowd which stands athwart the policy of the 'Nazification' of the Church, and which must therefore be crushed. I saw a pamphlet, emanating from Nazi circles, which put the situation precisely in that light. It discussed measures for the liquidation of the Church problem, and certain proposals were followed by the words: 'There can be no doubt that in this . . . way the influence of the Confessional Synods on the church people will be broken, and room made for free, spiritual speculation, which will stand under the imprint of advancing National Socialism.' But in spite of its perilous position (or because of it?) the Confessional Church seems to be growing in numbers and unity. Reliable figures are difficult to obtain, and are constantly changing anyhow, but it appears that of the 18,000 German clergy some 6,000 are Confessional Church supporters. Of the laity who still actively support the churches and attend them, inquiry in many different areas suggested that 80 per cent. are with the Confessional Church. Of the remainder of the clergy about 10,000 appear to rank as 'neutrals,' but the majority of these would sympathize with the Confessional wing in differing degrees. The 'German Christians' are said to claim about 2,000 of the clergy for their camp, but this is perhaps an exaggeration. In any case, this last group seems to be a diminishing force. They still receive Government favour, and have a majority in one or two of the smaller Regional churches (*e.g.* Thuringia); but they are essentially compromise people, endeavouring to combine Christianity and National Socialism, and as the issue becomes more explicitly a choice between Christ and Rosenberg they will probably disappear. Rosenberg himself has little use for them. A circular letter of his repudiates them as definitely as it does the Confessional Church. They attempt a fusion of Christianity and the National Socialist 'philosophy' which Rosenberg regards as unwanted by the Party.

What is now the theological position in the Confessional Church? Is it somewhat rigid and reactionary dogmatically? Such questions are partly answered by the observation that the Confessional Church is not a compact body under one central authority, subscribing to a common creed. It is a federation of many different groups to defend Christianity in the face of the common danger. It falls first into two main sections: (1) The 'Provisional Church Administration' ('Vorläufige Kirchenleitung'), which constitutes the leadership of the Dahlem body of which Pastor Niemöller was a centre man; (2) the 'Lutheran Council' ('Lutherischer Rat'), which is the rallying authority for those Regional Lutheran churches which are Confessional Church supporters. Within these two principal sections other groupings and alignments are found, sometimes indeed cutting across them. There are Barthians and Liberals, Lutherans and Reformed, and the allegiances represented by membership of the 'intact' Regional churches such as Hanover, Bavaria, and Wurtemberg (all three Lutheran). These facts obviously mean a variety of theological thinking, but, speaking in a general way, the theological position is conservative, and occupied with dogmatic affirmation. What we may call the 'Faith and Order' side of the presentation of Christianity holds the field, and less attention is momentarily paid to 'Life and Work.' The Government attitude to Christianity is, of course, largely responsible for this. Any attempt to present the 'social gospel,' to work out the implications of the Christian faith in terms of the economic order, State and individual, community life and so on, is repressed as 'political' Christianity. And whatever the future may bring for the German Church, my impression is that the interpretation of the faith will be narrowed for years to an individual, soul-comforting, soul-saving gospel. If that results in a deeper personal experience of the grace and will of God amongst Christians in Germany, the ultimate issue may be something for which to thank God. It may eventually bring a clearer vision of the full, ethical implications of the revelation in Jesus, plus greater power and will to implement them. Would English Christianity have gone so far with the 'social gospel' without the Evangelical Revival?

It is in the Dahlem section of the Confessional Church that one finds the most conservative and rigid dogmatism, and Biblical fundamentalism. Here the influence of Karl Barth is predominant; although in the German Church as a whole, Barth's influence seems to be declining since his departure from the country. And it is Barthian Biblicalism which supplies Rosenberg with the main target for his attack on the Christian faith. He has replied to the Church criticism of *The Myth of the Twentieth Century* in a little book, recently published, called *Protestant Pilgrims to Rome* and bearing the sub-title *The Betrayal of Luther and The Myth of the Twentieth Century.* It accuses the Confessional Church of unfaithfulness to all that was truly eternal and German (synonymous terms for Rosenberg) in Luther's Reformation, and, under the leadership of that Swiss 'Calvinistic pseudo-pope,' Karl Barth, of taking the German Protestants Rome-wards by a 'Romish' stress on creed, revelation, Church, and Church authority. The Confessionals are said to set Bible texts across the onward march of the German people to self-emancipation and fullness of life. Our German fellow-Christians are, of course, better able to judge than we are where, in their situation, the main emphases must fall for the upholding of the truth of the gospel, but it does seem unfortunate that Rosenberg has so much opportunity of representing the defenders of the Christian position as theological re-actionaries, setting dogma before life.

What is happening in the Protestant faculties of the universities in the midst of all this conflict? What kind of future is before them as centres of Christian scholarship and sources of the succession for the Christian ministry?

Here, as amongst the churches, there is both fear and hope, despair and confidence. A professor whose name is well known amongst English theologians assured me that we could count on the continuance of the high standards of German theological teaching, and send over our students with every confidence that they would get able scholarship free of political bias. In fact, the hope was earnestly expressed by several professors that we should continue to send students, since their presence was a help in the situation. But though several of the theological faculties seem still to be doing good work with an able staff, it must be admitted that some things are not re-assuring. The position of professors is more secure than it was, since at the beginning of this year the law (previously in abeyance) that a professor may not be transferred or dismissed, except through the regular procedure of the proper disciplinary courts, was re-introduced. This means that the older men now holding Chairs will probably remain, provided they exercise discretion in matters political. Odd things, however, may occur in new appointments through political sympathies counting for more than academic qualification. In one of the smaller theological faculties, an astronomer has been appointed to the Chair of New Testament; and for a recent work he published on Mark he is said to have required his wife's assistance with the Greek! But maybe he will hitch New Testament study to a star! He should at least be an able interpreter of the story of the Magi!

The position of lecturers seems the most unsatisfactory, and it looks as though the maintenance of an efficient succession is to be a problem. Recently, a regulation was introduced requiring all lecturers to do three weeks in a special 'Akademie' to ensure acquaintance with the Nazi view of life. Plainly this can become a means of weeding out the 'politically unreliable'; although the extent to which it so acts seems at the moment to depend largely on the individual at the head of such an 'Akademie.' But after he is through this school, a lecturer may find his appointment is made only from semester (about three months) to semester; and the notification that he is to resume his teaching in a given semester may not arrive until just before, or even after, its commencement! Lecturers showing enthusiasm for the régime would not, I imagine, be subject to this kind of disability.

On the whole situation in the universities I think we can only reserve judgment, and hope for the best. Some faculties are unsound from a Christian and academic standpoint. Jena, for instance, has gone 'German Christian' to the extreme, and moved from its specifically Christian basis, renaming itself 'Fakultät für religiöse Erziehung.' But elsewhere, much good work is done, and the best traditions of German theological scholarship are upheld by men whom we have learnt to respect, but what the future will bring can only be expressed by the words so often spoken to me in reference to the future of the Christian Church throughout Germany—'We do not know.' The number of theological students in the universities has decreased by 50 per cent., although that is only slightly more than the decrease of the whole German student population. Five years ago, of course, there were too many theological students, but now there are not enough. In some faculties the numbers are very low. Bonn, which previously had from three to four hundred, had only twenty-seven in a recent semester.

I would like to close with a word which was spoken to me about our attitude on this side to the German Church situation, and the sufferings which some of our fellow-Christians there have to accept. One who has himself been in difficulties said: 'We do not approve when the troubles of Christians in Germany are used as an instrument for the stimulation of feeling against Germany. We love our Fatherland, and want to serve our Fatherland, and to co-operate where we can with its government. We are not helped, therefore, when the sufferings of the Church are turned into anti-German, political propaganda, and the ears of the world thereby deafened to Germany's national rights and needs.' That seems to me to point to something vitally important, if there is going to be a solution of the German problem in Europe to-day. We shall make a big mistake if we allow all of which we disapprove in Nazi policy and methods to blind us to what justice there may be in many of Germany's claims. That the German Government is doing wrong in its treatment of minorities within Germany does not excuse us from doing right; and surely we do not need the exaggerations of Hitler's speeches to tell us that since Versailles Germany has good cause for grievance.

Perhaps the day is not far distant when the rank and file of intelligent people in this country will see clearly that political appeasement and security can be established, not by re-armament, but only by a more radical transformation of foreign policy in the direction of justice with generosity. Perhaps not until such appeasement has come about will the lot of our fellow Christians in Germany improve.

This article appears anonymously to avoid any possible embarrassment to our fellow Christians in Germany. It is the record by a person in a responsible position of a visit just paid.—[Editor].

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Do you Carry, or Lean?

By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Lisbon.

'Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ.'—Gal 6[2].

'Every man shall bear his own burden.'—Gal. 6[5].

In cities and towns we are used to seeing hearses and motors at funerals. But in remote country places in Scotland they often have walking funerals. The coffin is carried on long staves or 'spokes' as they are commonly called. There may be six or eight bearers, two abreast, on each side; and when, as often happens, there is a long distance to go, the bearers have no light task, even if the mourners take turns and relieve the bearers.

On one such occasion, when the procession had at last reached the graveyard one of the bearers said to another, 'I'm awfu' tired wi' carryin'.' 'Do you *carry*?' said the other. 'Ay! whit do you dae?' 'Oh! me?' was the reply, 'I aye *lean*.' Then the other knew why he was so tired.

There are always these two sorts of people: the people who carry, and the people who lean on those who carry; and because there are so many who lean, things are what they are and not what they might and could be.

At home, for instance, there is the girl who takes everything for granted and lets everything be done for her by somebody else. She never offers to do anything. She knows that if she sits still somebody else will do it—servants, sisters, mother—she doesn't care who, so long as she hasn't to do it. Has a message to be run? She is too busy, even her lessons absorb her then! The smaller things to be done in the house, many of which she might at least offer to do, she dodges. She just won't see them. If a volunteer is called, it is not she who answers; and if she is bidden to do something she does it with the air of a martyr. She doesn't carry, she leans. That is one reason why mother is so often tired, and why servants give notice so often in that house. And she doesn't know how much pleasure she is missing; for to carry one's own burdens is a Christian's duty, and to carry other people's burdens is a Christian's pleasure.

At every school there are those who carry and those who lean. There are the boys who are proud of their school and have a right to be proud of it, because they are doing their best for it in work and in games and in its social life, pulling their weight, carrying their share of its burdens, helping others, even helping their teachers!

There are the others who are very loud-voiced in shouting the praises of their school, but who do nothing to make it praiseworthy. Shirkers at games, they won't train; they'll only yell at the touch-line and brag, '*we* beat them.' Shirkers at lessons, they won't work. At any entertainment they are in the audience applauding or criticising, but never on the platform. They 'can't be bothered' to sing. It's a fag to get up a part in a play. There are plenty others to do these things. They take all the school can give, and they give nothing. They don't carry, they lean.

In churches it is the same. Those who are willing have too much put on them because so many others are content to lean. About half in every congregation do nothing but lean. A church in which every member did what he could, in which everybody bore his own burden and nobody leaned, would be a wonderful thing. It could do anything! If every congregation in Scotland was like that there would be no more deficits.

I remember once spending a holiday on a battleship during naval manœuvres. It was tremendously interesting, but there was a 'fly in my ointment.' Every day the Admiral, who was on our ship, went his rounds, and every day I had a busy time dodging him round the ship! I was the only person unwilling to meet him face to face, of all that great ship's company. Why? Because I was the only person who wasn't doing something. The others were all carrying, each his own burden of work; I was leaning. Of course I wasn't one of the crew, but still it made me feel most uncomfortable.

And the person who leans on others who carry, and makes their burden heavier, *ought* to feel uncomfortable.

What are you doing at home and at school? Leaning or carrying? What sort of person are you going to be in the world when you grow up? One who carries his own share, or one who shirks and leaves it all to others?

Those who carry their own burdens bravely and honestly keep their own self-respect. Those who help to carry others' burdens have the respect of others, and find a great joy in life; for to 'bear one another's burdens' is to fulfil the law of Christ.

Garments of Righteousness.

By the Reverend Charles W. Budden, M.A., M.D., Croydon.

'Wherewithal shall we be clothed?'—Mt 6[31].

When the late King of Yugoslavia (Alexander) came to the throne the peasant people, according to their custom, presented him with a shirt. But it was not an ordinary shirt. It was made of gold thread, and was very beautiful. We often find that in the East the giving of clothes has a special meaning. Thus Elijah laid his mantle upon Elisha. In the Book of Esther, Mordecai was clothed with the robe 'which the king useth to wear.' And even in modern times a Persian Ambassador signed a treaty between his country and Russia, as 'The Lord of the Dagger set in jewels, and the Sword adorned with gems, and of the Shawl-coat already worn by the king,' these having been royal gifts to him from the Shah's person.

So in the classic friendship of David and Jonathan, 'Jonathan stripped himself of the robe that was upon him, and gave it to David, and his apparel, even to his sword, and to his bow, and to his girdle.'

St. Peter says that we should be clothed with humility. The Greek word which is translated 'clothed' has rather a curious meaning. The word is used only in this place in the New Testament. It refers to the overall or apron which the slaves wore fastened round their waist with a girdle. They put it on over their other garments to keep them from being soiled. So the word was connected with the lowliest service of the lowliest people.

I wonder why Peter used this word. I think it was because he wanted to tell the people to whom he was writing that they were to be ready to serve each other. They were not to be ashamed of the lowliest service if that service would help somebody else. They were to put away all pride and haughtiness and make themselves of no account.

And perhaps he was also thinking of the time when Jesus girded Himself with a towel to do a slave's work—to wash the disciples' feet.

Once there lived in Persia a shepherd named Dara who rose to be the governor of a province. As happens with all men who rise, there were jealous detractors, and, by and by, a scandal was started that he took money from the people by unjust means, and that he stored it in a huge chest which he always carried about with him wherever he went. At last an investigation was made and the chest opened. Inside it was just an old shepherd's coat.

Then the governor explained that this was the coat he had worn when he lived in his native village. He kept it because it helped him to rule justly and kindly. He was afraid that he might become proud and vain and harsh, but when he looked at the coat it reminded him how poor and lowly a man he had been, and it helped to keep him humble and kind.

We think at once of the touching incident in the Parable of the Prodigal Son—where the exuberance of the father's love bids them cast the best robe round the rags of his long-lost boy.

We think of the beautiful promise in the Book of Revelation that 'he that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment.' Is not this the answer to our text? You remember the text. 'Wherewithal shall we be clothed?' For the dress we must aspire to is that which can only be given to us by Jesus—the garment of righteousness.

The Christian Year.

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Sacrament of Love.

'He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?'—1 Jn 4[20].

'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. This is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' In this great dual saying, cited from the Jewish law, our Lord evidently assents to the view that the first of all human duties is that of loving God; that of loving man is emphatically subordinated to it. How comes it, then, that our text puts, or seems to put, matters the other way round? This writer tells us that unless we are sincere in our love of one another it is of no use professing to love God; and he enforces his argument by declaring in effect that love of God has to be learned from love of man, and that it is not such a very easy matter to love a being one has never seen; one can only ascend through the experience of human fellowship to the apprehension of a still higher—namely, fellowship with the divine and eternal. He is unquestionably right, though there comes a point beyond which all analogies break down in the effort to illustrate or explain the relations of the soul with God. Nor is there any discrepancy between his opinion and that of Jesus on the subject, as we shall see. Love of God can never rightly be separated from love of man, however far the one may transcend the other and ought so to do. He who is incapable of the lower love, or poor and shallow in the amount of it he evinces, is *ipso facto* incapable of the higher, or false and unreal in his assertion of it. 'If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar.' Hate or indifference to the needs of man, cruelty in one's treatment of one's fellows, is quite incompatible with love of God, though, as we know to our shame, it has often been found consistent with a certain degree of religious sentiment.

Throughout all the Christian centuries, as well as in the best period of the Old Testament religion, the greatest stress has been laid on the joy, combined with the duty and privilege, of putting love to God before everything else. Every Church exhorts its members to do this. We have been repeatedly warned by persons wise in the things of the Spirit, the great ones of the heavenly kingdom in every generation, not to suffer our affection for the creature to hinder that which is due from us to the Creator. Again and again we read in the lives of great saints that they have had to make their choice between the two kinds of love, and have deliberately forgone the delights of human fellowship rather than allow anything to compete ever so slightly with their all-absorbing loyalty to their Maker.

Beware of robbing God by loving the creature; beware of attaching yourself too strongly to any human soul—son or daughter, father or mother, husband or wife, lover or friend—for if you do you will be incapable of scaling the highest heights of fellowship with God. Such are the monitions addressed to us by those austere, lonely spirits who dwell amid the rigours and grandeurs of a religious experience inaccessible to all but a few.

St. Bernard of Clairvaux felt himself called to withdraw from all family relationships and to expose his feeble constitution to the severest hardships as a member of a monastic community dwelling in the wilderness far from all other human habitations. Bernard's letters are very remarkable compositions, and give us a better insight into his character than his theological works. In one of these addressed to a friend he says: 'To love God is to love charity, and therefore it is to labour for charity, to strive to love and be loved for the sake of God, which alone is worthy of our zeal in the service of man.'

Professor Lecky, in his *History of European Morals*, tells of a so-called saint, the only son of his parents, whose dying mother sought for a last interview with him and remained outside the monastery door all night knocking and pleading for admission, or for but one word of comfort or one glimpse of the face of her dearly beloved. She received no response; the saint was dead to the world, he said: he had nothing to do with one human being more than another; he loved all alike and none in particular. And, the monkish chronicler adds for the benefit of his readers, the mother died unheeded on the doorstep, and when the saint went forth the next morning he passed unconcerned over her body, piously commending to heaven the soul of a departed sinner.

Contrast with all this the numerous beautiful and touching examples in which history abounds, and not infrequently to be met with in everyday life, of the devotion of one human being to another. Bernard Shaw says that sex love is the most transient of human passions, and perhaps it is, but it can be spiritualized and made lasting with the sublimest results in the elevation of character. It uncovers mysterious deeps within the soul, enlarges the whole being, and transforms the arena in which it is exercised, however drab and sordid, into a world of wonder and glory. And, whatever may have to be said of the undependableness of human nature in this regard, our total experience would be immeasurably the poorer and meaner if this mode of manifestation of the eternal life-energy could be taken out of it. This yearning of one soul to lose itself in another, and to find itself in larger measure by so doing, is certainly not a thing to be scorned and repudiated; if God be not in that He is nowhere. And surely there can be no two opinions concerning that of a mother and her offspring. Maternal love has been said, and rightly, to be the most unselfish of human feelings. We cannot believe that in the sight of God love of this kind can be anything but good and elevating to the soul.

There are people who would say that they cannot love God, that to them He is but a name, whereas men and women and little children are real and near and need such love as we have to give. We cannot help loving God if we have ever loved any living thing nobly, unselfishly, and given ourselves in doing it. What we love in one another *is* God, but we must learn to reach through the particular to the universal, through the human to the divine

He prayeth best, who loveth best
All things both great and small;
For the dear God who loveth us,
He made and loveth all.

To Catholic saintship the privilege of beholding what is called the beatific vision has always been held to be one of the greatest tokens of God's favour. One form in which it has been experienced is that of an appearance of the figure of the glorified Christ to the gaze of the devotee. The story of the praying monk to whose astonished and enraptured vision the Christ appeared one day just as he was quitting his cell to go and minister to the sick at the monastery gate is a familiar one. He hesitated, for he had long hoped and prayed for this great joy which might never be his again. But with a sigh he turned and went, only to find when he came back that the radiant presence was still there. And, looking upon him with kind eyes, the Master said: 'Hadst thou stayed I should have gone.'

Some people have the sense of God in a greater degree than others. But this particular faculty does not argue superior sanctity on the part of any one; it is no sign of exceptional merit any more than the possession of an ear for music; it is simply a trust given for a specific purpose. Some of the best people in the world have never had it. All they have is a certain peace and satisfaction realized in the service of their kind, with perhaps an added feeling that the love they give and receive is an intimation of the presence of something higher from which it comes. Let us say to all such: We would that you might love God for Himself; that you might know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge; but you are right in seeking for it in the way you are doing, for assuredly God is there. And we have the authority of Christ for saying this: 'Lord, when saw we thee hungry, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.' [1]

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Assurances of God's Favour.

BY THE REVEREND NORMAN V. HOPE, M.A., B.D., BUSBY, GLASGOW.

'If it had not been the Lord who was on our side.'—Ps 124[1].

The precise circumstances which this psalm was written to celebrate are not known. All that is clear and certain is this—that the psalmist and his comrades of Israel had recently been signally delivered from the power of evil in some form or other. 'And,' he says, 'this signal delivery is a plain and clear proof of the fact that God was and is on our side.'

Now this is still a most urgent and important question—as urgent and important for us as for the psalmist and those who were associated with him. Have we any reason for supposing that the Lord is on our side? Have we any grounds for believing that He is interested in us, and is willing to help and strengthen us in our life's journey through the world? The question is thus put by Aldous Huxley in his most recent book. 'Does the world as a whole possess the value and meaning that we constantly attribute to certain parts of it (such as human beings and their works), and, if so, what is the nature of this value and meaning? This is a question which, a few years ago, I should not even have posed. For like so many of my contemporaries I took it for granted that there was no meaning.' (*End and Means*, 269 f.).

---

[1] R. J. Campbell, *Vision and Life*, 54.

I want to suggest three reasons for believing that this is so—that the Lord is on our side.

1. If it had not been that the Lord was on our side, He would not have made us as we are.

Of course there is no doubt that man has an animal side to his nature. All modern science has gone to prove that man, in respect of his bodily capacities and powers—even in respect of his physical structure—is linked to the brute creation. But—and this is the point at the moment—there is something more in human nature than these capacities which man has in common with the animals. For he has, or rather is, a wondering dreaming soul; he has a longing for the infinite, a hunger and thirst after God. For example, Frank Bullen in his book, *With Christ at Sea*, writes thus: 'Arriving at Sydney, I soon succeeded in getting a berth as lamp-trimmer in one of the coasting steamers, and for the next twelve months made a pretty complete circuit of the Australasian colonies, living on the best of everything, earning good wages. . . . Often I would stand on deck, when anchored in Sydney Harbour, on Sunday mornings, and listen to the church bells playing "Sicilian Mariners," *with a dull ache at my heart, a deep longing for something, I knew not what.*'

Now this capacity for God which is inherent in every man—no matter how it may be concealed or covered over by sin and folly—is something which proves that God is on our side. If God had not been on our side, He would never have made us with this capacity, He would never have implanted in us these deep longings after Himself.

This point has been made—from a rather different point of view—by Mr. Austin Dobson in his Prayer of the Swine to Circe. It runs thus:

> If swine we be—if we indeed be swine,
> Daughter of Perse, make us swine indeed,
> Well pleased on litter straw to lie supine,
> Stirred by all instincts of the bestial breed;
> But O Unmerciful! O Pitiless!
> Leave us not thus with sick men's hearts to bleed!
> To waste long days in yearning, dumb distress
> And memory of things gone, and utter hopelessness.

The fact that there are instincts and impulses and capacities in us that refuse to be satisfied by the merely material is a proof that the Lord is on our side. Had He not been, He would not have made us as we are.

2. If it had not been the Lord who was on our side, He would not have placed us in such a world as this.

From the point of view of God and His relation to humanity, the most important fact about this world in which we have been placed is this—that every experience we undergo in it, if rightly used by us, may serve to produce strong, resolute, enduring character, that is, self-elected goodness. From any other point of view than this—the point of view of character—we cannot say that this world is by any means the best conceivable. For example, we should not say that it is the best possible world for the pursuit of pleasure. For the fact is that there is far too much pain and sorrow in it—of a quite inescapable kind—to make it the best of all possible worlds for the pleasure-lover. A world which would be ideal from this point of view would contain much less hardship, and struggle, and pain. Nor is this the best world imaginable for the making of money. For money-making depends on a number of factors—for example, of body, mind, will, and opportunity—which are not within the control of every individual. So while some men make money, others do not. No, it is not the best of all possible worlds from the money-maker's point of view.

But it definitely is the best of all possible worlds from the point of view of producing character—firm reliable character. For there is not one single experience—of all that men and women must undergo in this world—which cannot be made to contribute to this end, to the production of character. Thus an experience of joy—and happily there is none who does not have such—can be used to bring a man nearer to God, giving him deeper insight, and making him more thankful. With 'the deep power of joy,' said Wordsworth, 'we see into the heart of things.' And, on the other hand, an experience of sorrow can be used to develop qualities of character which otherwise the sufferer might not possess—such as sympathy, and pity, and tenderness. Again, possession of wealth may be used to contribute to the development of such notes of high character as liberality and a sense of stewardship. And poverty also may be used to give a man a true sense of values in life. And the significant fact about life is this—that no one escapes experiences of both joy and sorrow. As William Blake the poet put it:

> Joy and woe are woven fine,
> A clothing for the soul divine;
> Under every grief and pine
> Runs a joy with silken twine.

It is right it should be so;
Man was made for joy and woe;
And when this we rightly know,
Thro' the world we safely go.

3. If it had not been the Lord who was on our side, He would not have sent us Jesus Christ. This is the final, the crowning, the decisive proof that the Lord is on our side.

Why did He send us Jesus Christ?

He sent us Jesus Christ first and foremost to reveal Himself in His true nature, as He really is. That is to say, before Jesus Christ's coming to earth, men—at least, certain of them, in particular places of the world—had discovered things about God which were certainly true, as far as they went. Of course, they could never have discovered these things about God had it not pleased God to reveal Himself to them: man's religious discovery must always wait upon God's revelation. The Hebrews had discovered much more than any other race concerning God's being and character. It had been revealed to them that God was one—that there were not lords many and gods many, as the Greeks supposed, and that there were not two gods, one good and the other evil, as the Persians believed. And that God, besides being the creator of the heavens and the earth, was a God of righteousness and justice and purity—that is, that He was a moral God. Now, such things as these constitute really momentous discoveries concerning God. But what Jesus Christ revealed was this, that deeper than anything else in His nature and character is His love—that the truest description of God is just that He is love. It was left for Jesus Christ to reveal God as God most truly is. For this cause He was sent into this world.

But God likewise sent Jesus Christ to this world to show mankind how human life ought to be lived, in order to be completely acceptable to God. That is to say, Jesus Christ not merely revealed God as God most truly is, but He likewise revealed man as man should be, and man's life as it should be lived. His earthly life in the days of His flesh was lived in daily communion with and dependence upon God; it was actuated by nothing but the purest and most unselfish of motives; and it was directed to the most beneficent and redemptive ends of service and love and sacrifice on behalf of others. It was a life from which the element of selfishness had been entirely eliminated.

Finally, God sent His son Jesus Christ into this world not merely to reveal His essential character, and not merely to reveal to mankind the perfect pattern of life as God would have it lived, but also to give the power to live such a life. It is one thing for men and women to be shown how to live, and to accept such an ideal as one worthy of their allegiance; but it is another and quite a different thing to copy such a pattern. There is, in particular, the fact, the ugly fact, of past sin and failure, what Lord Morley once called 'that horrid burden and impediment on the soul that the Churches call sin, and which, by whatever name we call it, is a very real catastrophe in the moral nature of man.' But Jesus Christ came into this world to cleanse men and women from sin, from its guilt and from its power. He offers them pardon for their misdeeds, and the power of the Holy Spirit to energize, enrich, and empower their lives.

For these reasons, then, God sent us Jesus Christ, to live and die and rise again in this world. And the fact that He has done so is the crowning proof that He is on our side. What shall we say then to these things? If God be with us who can be against us? The Lord is on our side—what else finally matters in life than this? If we have this sublime assurance—as we have—there is nothing of which we need be afraid.

Third Sunday after Trinity.

The Hardness of Life.

'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.'—Mt 11$^{28-30}$.

That is a saying we all like to think about, a saying that is deeply consoling. And yet there is no saying that sometimes seems more like a mockery when we are up against the hardness of life. After all, we reflect, the Man who said it was Himself crucified, and cannot have found life very easy. Yet He did say it! And what is more, all the greatest of His disciples have said it also.

We find life hard, do we not? And, what is more, life *is* hard; it is terribly hard. There are certain people in whom life is not very intense. They do not enjoy it tremendously, and they do not suffer very much; but that is because living and suffering belong together. If we are not very much alive, we shall escape a good deal of pain. We shall not escape altogether if we have got any life at all. And the more life we have, the more pain we shall have, the harder our life will be, and the more suffering we shall endure; the more of everything we shall get out of it. And because we are getting a lot out of it, we shall have to pay.

The more people we love, the more people there are to hurt us. The more we love any person, the more that person will be able to hurt us. This is not because people are wicked or cruel, although sometimes they are, but because it is the nature of life to be like that. If we love a person very much, then 'every parting is a little death.'

It is as true of other things as of love. Ambition and success and truth and beauty—they all mean giving up a lot and enduring a lot. They all mean paying a great price.

The reason why it is hard to accept this saying without resentment is because we know somewhere, at the bottom of our consciousness, *that we were meant to be happy*. We see, as we think, other people having things we have not got, and we feel furiously, we feel justly, that we ought to have them; that love and beauty and joy, happiness, work and success belong to us all, are really ours by right. They belong to us, and there is something in us that rebels against the lack of them.

Very often, when we go to people for advice, what we really want is that they should show us a way by which we may get happiness without its dreadful cost. We want people to show us how to live a life which shall be decent and self-respecting, and perhaps even noble, and not too difficult. We want to find a way out. That is often why, when we go to ask for advice and do not get advice that shows us how to live life easily, we go away and say that the adviser has not understood us.

A book was published some years ago that had a wide circulation. It was called *The Right to Happiness*. What is the use of talking about the right to be happy when we cannot enforce it? Of course we have a right to be happy; but what then? Suppose (as is the case with most of us) happiness means somebody's love, and that person does not love us—what is the use of talking about the right to happiness then? We want success, and we cannot command it. We want health, and we cannot ensure it. What is the use of talking about the right to happiness? We may have the right, but we cannot enforce it.

Lately it must surely have struck many of us that those who grab what they can get, and seem to be happy for a time, come often to a tragic end. Quite young people are committing suicide, because they have ransacked life for its experiences and its joys, and have come through to the other side with absolutely nothing left to live for. It is true, literally true, of the body, but it is equally true of the mind. People who 'dope' themselves first of all with the excitements of life, and then 'dope' themselves literally with alcohol or with drugs, find in the end there is not anything left. The body is rotten and the mind is flat and satiated.

Notice also the tragic horror of old age among people who try to find life altogether easy and joyful and exciting. It is piteous to see people who really feel there is nothing left when youth has gone, and beauty and physical vitality. Yet sometimes one sees old people whose spirit shines through their bodies like a flame in a lamp. These are not people to whom the easy way appealed! And when old age comes, it is to them only the beginning of something more wonderful, more alive, more noble, finer than anything they had in youth.

'Take my *yoke* upon you . . . for my *yoke* is easy, and my *burden* is light.' He never said: 'Come unto me, and you will not have any yoke, and you will not have any burden.' Christ always faced the hardness of life. Has that saying about the sparrows not falling to the ground without our Father—for they do fall to the ground! He never pretended they would not—never been a puzzle? We have to carry the burden. We have to bear the yoke, even if we go to Christ. Take the whole of His teaching and we see that He does not dope us into thinking that life is anything but hard. But He makes it worth while. That is what makes it easy in one sense. In one sense it will never be easy, but in the best sense, it does become easy, because those who sit at the feet of Christ, those who follow Him and walk in His way begin to see the purpose of it and the sense of it and the worth of it.

When we see that, it is much easier to bear than the awful disillusioning misery of the satiated soul, which has no purpose in its own life and therefore no purpose in its pain. Indeed there *is* no purpose in such pain if the sufferer is right about life. How intolerable is the hardness of life when there is no sense in it! Compared with this, how easy is the yoke of Christ, how light His burden to carry! How joyful to follow when we know that we are learning our way back to God! 'I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us,' said St. Paul, a man tormented with physical illness, a man without home, without family, without wife or children, a man who suffered in his flesh the hardest kind of punishment and pain, who was hunted from place to place, imprisoned, alone. All this he found easy because he knew its purpose and its end. 'The earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God,' or, as Moffatt puts it, 'Even the creation waits with eager longing for the sons of God to be revealed.'

And they are revealed whenever we face the hardness and the pain of life in the spirit of Christ.

At the end our Lord on the Cross summed up all that has been written here, when, at one moment He said: 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' and the next: 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.'[1]

Fourth Sunday after Trinity.

Things Jesus would like to have done and couldn't.

'He could there do no mighty work.'—Mk 6[5].

'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now.'—Jn 16[12].

'How often would I have gathered thy children together . . . and ye would not.'—Lk 13[34].

At first hearing it sounds startling to say that there was anything which Jesus couldn't do if He wanted. It wouldn't be in the least strange to say it about the rest of us—ordinary men and women. There are many things which we should like to do but can't. There isn't a man of literary tastes who hasn't wished to be able to write some masterpiece. There isn't a pianist who hasn't wished he could play like Pachmann or Paderewski or Backhaus. We would *like* to be giants in literature or art, or oratory, or business or sport. But we do not waste very much time in brooding over wishes of this sort. We know we haven't got it in us to be great writers or great musicians or great orators or great men of business or even great cricketers.

But while there is nothing strange or surprising in there being many things we should like to do but can't, it is strange to hear that same thing said about Jesus. So far as sheer power was concerned there was really nothing Jesus could not have done had He wished. For all power had been given to Him in heaven and on earth. The failure was not in Jesus but in the men with whom He was dealing. It was not that He did not possess the power—it was that men would not let the power be exercised.

Nazareth. The first text is taken from the story of His visit to Nazareth. Probably our Lord paid *two* visits to Nazareth. The first, which Luke records, took place at the very beginning of His ministry, and ended in an attempt at murder. The second, which Matthew and Mark record, took place at a later stage in His ministry. Our Lord—in spite of the murderous assault of the previous visit—was intent on giving Nazareth a second chance.

What might have happened in Nazareth had Jesus been able to do what He wanted to do! The shadows would have been lifted from every darkened home that day, and the anxieties banished from every burdened heart. For if Jesus had had His way, if He had been allowed to do what He wanted to do, there would not have been a sick bed left in Nazareth, there would not have been a blind man, or a deaf man, or a lame man, or a leprous man left in Nazareth at the end of the day. Nazareth would have been a singing, rejoicing, exulting town at the end of the day. A few homes were the happier for His coming. But that was little or nothing compared to the blessing He had it in His heart to give. He had meant to bless the town and every one in it. But His gracious purpose was foiled. 'He could there do no mighty work.'

What was it thwarted and baffled Him? 'He did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief.' Jesus had grown up in Nazareth. He had been the village carpenter or builder. The Nazarenes had seen Him regularly at work in the shop. They had given their orders to Him. His mother and brothers lived still in the old home and His brothers carried on the business, and there was nothing extraordinary about them. The Nazarenes simply couldn't believe that this Man who had lived amongst them for thirty years was a prophet of the Lord, much less the Messiah.

The Gospels make it clear that belief had to be present before Jesus accomplished His mighty works. They were not simply stark deeds of power. They were moral miracles.

'He could there do no mighty work.' Is that true of this land of ours? Is it true of this Church of ours? We don't hear very much about mighty works being done in our midst. It isn't that the power of Christ has lessened—it isn't that He is any less eager to bless. We are not straitened in our Lord, we are straitened in ourselves. Christ can't do what He wants to do, because of our unbelief. We hear still of His mighty works where humble faith has prepared the way for Him. Hearts are still cleansed, lives are still renewed, when there is the faith to believe that Christ can do it.

The Disciples. The second example is taken from our Lord's farewell speech to His disciples. 'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now.' There was nothing slow or stupid about Peter or about John. What was amiss with them really was not that they were dull, but that they were prejudiced. They were so indoctrinated with the current Jewish notions of the Messiah, that they simply could not receive what Jesus wanted to say to them. Again and again He told them that He was to die. They simply refused to believe it. The result was that the Cross took them by surprise, and well-nigh broke their hearts. Whenever Jesus talked about His Cross He also talked about rising again. That, too, fell upon deaf ears.

---

[1] M. Royden, *Here—and Hereafter*, 53.

One wonders what these things were about which Jesus would like to have spoken to His disciples. Would He have liked to have told them why it behoved the Christ to suffer? Had Jesus been able to tell His disciples this, the Christian Church would have been spared much controversy and debate. Anselm's theory of the Atonement, Grotius' theory, Calvin's theory, McLeod Campbell's theory—they give us aspects of the great wonder of the Cross. But Christ's theory—if He had been allowed to give it—would have explained it all. But what was the use of trying to explain the Cross to people who refused to believe a Cross would ever be set up?

Does not Christ often find Himself in exactly the same plight with us? He can't tell us all He wants to tell, because we are not able to receive.

Jerusalem. The third illustration is our Lord's lament over Jerusalem—stubborn, obstinate, perverse, unbelieving Jerusalem. Luke suggests that it was spoken while Jesus was yet in Galilee, and that what provoked it was our Lord's remark that a prophet could not perish out of Jerusalem. Matthew suggests that it was uttered in Jerusalem itself, after those indignant woes which Jesus pronounced upon Scribes and Pharisees. Jesus knew that now the breach between Him and the authorities was final, and that so far as Jerusalem was concerned His mission had failed.

When danger threatens the little chicks, the mother bird shelters them with her wings. Well, Jesus says He wanted to do something similar for the people of Jerusalem. He saw doom impending over Jerusalem. He may have foreseen that if Jerusalem's rulers continued in their then course, that *political* ruin and destruction would overtake them. But the reference is not to be narrowed down to that terrible 'fall' of Jerusalem which took place less than forty years later. There is another and still more dreadful doom. And from that doom Jesus wanted to save the people by setting them right with God and by making their religion a reality and not a sham.

Christ still is the Christ who is unable to do what He wants to do—unable to confer upon us this blessing which at infinite cost He has won for us all. He lamented over Jerusalem—He laments for the same reason over many in this land, over the world.

> Just as I am, poor, wretched, blind,—
> Sight, riches, healing of the mind,
> Yea, all I need, in Thee to find,—

but whether we get sight, riches, healing of the mind depends on whether we are able to add that last line and say, 'O Lamb of God, I come.'[1]

---

[1] J. D. Jones, *Morning and Evening*, 227.

◆

The Supra-Racial Gospel.

By the Reverend Francis A. Evelyn, B.A. (Oxon), formerly Chaplain St. Peter's, Siena.

We all know that a religion of race-consciousness is being propagated in Germany, involving the glorification of one race—the Teutons, and the vilification of another—the Jews. All do not know, and many may be shocked to learn, that a favourite text-book of anti-Jewish propaganda is the Gospel according to St. John. Here, say the Nazis, is a piece of Scripture which needs no editing to bring it into line with our views. In it Jesus and the Jews confront each other in antagonism and hatred. The feud between them brought Him to death. To continue that feud is to perpetuate His spirit: for 'wherever this gospel shall be preached' will reverberate His own words 'Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do.'

I believe this to be a complete misconception of the Fourth Gospel; but like all misconceptions it has some ground to start from. These and similar words are a feature of this Gospel; anti-Jewish polemic fills a large portion of it—so large a portion indeed, compared with Synoptic records, that any one not swayed by historical or religious bias would feel bound at least to check its accuracy from other sources. It is strange to find German scholars indifferent to the need of scholarly criticism!

I should like, nevertheless, to begin by joining hands with German and other critics in recognizing that this record of the Life of Jesus, on its controversial side, reflects controversies of the period of its writing rather than the actual situation in Jesus' own lifetime. The intervening period may be comparatively long or short. Those who still hold to the tradition of Apostolic authorship believe it to have been comparatively short—more like fifty years than a hundred. But in a young, growing, and propagating movement like Christianity, less than fifty years is ample time for new problems and phases to have arisen which might—or shall we say must—even unconsciously colour a record of the past. No historian is quite impartial, and his history would be no history if he was—since historical figures are not impartial themselves. A late revered Principal of Pusey House, Oxford, used to remark that we could only escape presuppositions by being born, fully educated, at the age of about fifteen. But I will make a further admission. I believe that the atmosphere of bitter Jewish opposition to the nascent Church in which the author wrote has led him into a way of telling his story which, if not itself wholly erroneous, gives ground—as recent events show—for really deadly error. To put it briefly, comparison with the Synoptics makes clear that he speaks of the Jews where they speak of the Pharisees as the enemies of Jesus—equating a part of the nation with the whole, and seeming (though certainly not intending) to shift the controversy from higher ethical to lower racial ground. That such could not have been his intention becomes clear if we grasp what was the real purport of his Gospel—the supra-racial Gospel, as I have ventured to call it. I believe he wrote it largely to disprove the very theory for which the Nazis claim his patronage: to present Jesus as belonging to mankind apart from distinctions of race, and so in His Name to give the lie to all pharisaical pretensions of racial superiority, wherever they may be found.

To show this involves a brief survey of the Gospel as a whole. Incidentally this will reveal many passages in which the apparently anti-Jewish bias of others is counterbalanced. The Prologue is a magnificent claim for the universality of Jesus. The writer passes over the earthly parentage of Jesus, and only hints at His nationality in the words 'He came unto his own.' He is concerned with two facts. Jesus came from God and He came to be the Saviour of the world. Theological interest has since concentrated upon the Logos doctrine: but I expect that the author's own interest in this doctrine was closely related to its serviceableness for establishing his point, that Jesus by virtue of His divine descent belongs, not to one race, not even to one epoch, but to all. The Baptist in his lesser degree is regarded from a similar standpoint. His parentage is not noticed, his message is universalized. 'There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the Light, that all men through him might believe' (1^{6-7}).[1]

Against this sublime background we soon see human characters moving. They are the characters of Jews, and Jews (if I may so put it) at their best; verifying testimony, conquering prejudice. Christ shows His appreciation of the best side of Jewish character in His commendation of Nathanael: 'Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!' (1^{47}). There follows the episode of the marriage in Cana of Galilee. Details of it are 'patient' of a mystical interpretation—far more 'patient' than I am. Some, I think, regard the Mother of Jesus here as a symbolic figure representing the Old Testament, and interpret her Son's rebuke as the New Testament putting the Old in its place. Nazis and any others are welcome to explore these fantastic mines. My attention is held at the moment by a quite prosaic detail: 'there were set there six waterpots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews' (2^6). What attracts me is, that a ceremonial custom of the Jews, sometimes treated by Christ with scant respect (see Mk 7^{1-8}) here provides Him with means for His 'beginning of miracles.' And then in the next chapter, out of the pages of this supposed anti-Jewish tract, shines out the splendid and vivid portrait of that noble Jewish gentleman—also a Pharisee—Nicodemus. For there is a nobility and a dignity in Jewry which cannot and will not be ignored. Shakespeare, I think, sat down to write a popular caricature of Jewish foibles in 'Shylock'; and behold! out of his 'villain's' mouth come the speeches of an injured innocent—speeches which show the closing gibes about his enforced baptism to be in execrable taste, as Lewis Carroll pointed out to Ellen Terry. In the same way, if the author of the 'spiritual Gospel' really sat down to blacken the Jews, which I am sure he did not, he found himself defeated at the outset by his own Nicodemus and Nathanael, not to mention Philip and Andrew and Peter. And here again the Lord who has commended Nathanael pays Nicodemus, and in him his countrymen, the high compliment of expecting him, as 'a master of Israel,' to be at home in deep spiritual doctrine—which Nicodemus at the moment is very far from being. For it is certainly a spiritual and universal, not a racial and

[1] References, except where otherwise indicated, are to the Gospel according to St. John.

partial religion which Jesus presents to him, even while an analogy is drawn from ancient Jewish history. 'As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life' (3^{14-16}).

No one, I imagine, will dispute that the next episode, the conversation with the woman of Samaria, is a direct challenge to racial prejudice, Jewish prejudice in this case, but quite as applicable to anti-Jewish prejudice in other times; or that it contains in one verse the whole charter of spiritual religion: 'God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.' Yet before this charter is given, the Jewish dispensation is given its rightful due. 'We know what we worship: for salvation is of (ἐκ, coming out from) the Jews' (4^{21-24}). One may notice that what breaks through the barricade between Samaritan and Jew (Jesus is plainly called a Jew, and does not deny it) is a simple expression of elementary and universal human need: 'Give me to drink.' The same Gospel records that a Roman soldier's heart was wrung by a similar appeal from the Cross, when Jesus said 'I thirst' (4^{10} 19^{28}).

With ch. 5 we reach the storm-zone: though it is the more significant that we reach it through the attendance of Jesus at a Feast of the Jews. The whole central portion of the Gospel from chs. 5 to 12 is filled with controversy. Jesus and the Jews are in bitter, passionate opposition. I have already expressed the view that by 'the Jews' the author really means, not the nation as a whole, but the main body of the Pharisees—for even among these there were exceptions. Indeed, in ch. 7 v.^{32} onwards, he makes the distinction between 'the rulers' and 'the Pharisees' on the one hand, and the 'common people' on the other, many of whom were inclined to believe in Jesus: yet he almost immediately lapses back into his old terminology at ch. 8 v.^{22}, the enemies again being 'the Jews' (and, very strangely, Jews which have believed on Him v.^{31}). Such an interpretation brings his narrative into line with the Synoptists, where the conflict is clearly set, not between Jesus and His people, but between Jesus and their ruling caste. Detailed comparison within my limits is impossible: but take the two bitterest things said on each side. From the enemies' side—'Thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil' (8^{48}) ascribed to the Jews. 'This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils' (Mt 12^{24}) ascribed to the Pharisees. From the side of Jesus: 'Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do' (8^{44}) in controversy with 'the Jews'—see vv.$^{22, 48}$. 'Woe unto you, *scribes and Pharisees*, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves' (Mt 23^{15}). I have further suggested a reason for the author's transference of terms. The young Church of his day, as we know from the Acts and from St. Paul's Epistles, was at death-grips with Jewish racial prejudice. So, though in a lesser degree and at certain challenging moments, had been the historical Jesus. Probably the author makes more of these moments in retrospect than the history can well bear, in order to vindicate his vital thesis, that Jesus is indeed 'lifted up' for all mankind above the rivalries of race or class.

I need not pursue to the end my brief survey of the Fourth Gospel: it would only lead to reiterating points already made. I would rather end by giving a hearing to the Nazi case. Two Germans whom I greatly respect have assured me that no one can understand their anti-Semitic movement who is not a German and has not experienced the injuries done to a distressed and war-stricken Germany by Jewish profiteers. And, as often in such cases, I see my answer long after the time to give it has gone by. Suppose we have a sense of injury against some one who has wronged us. Granted that it is justified: does it follow that we are the best judges of the character, as a whole, of him against whom we have a grievance? Does not the exact opposite follow? Human nature is complex. We are blinded by the one offensive side we have seen to many better sides we have not seen—perhaps have refused to see. And is not a nation's character yet more complex? On that very ground, some of us stood out during the War against a sweeping condemnation of the whole German race for crimes alleged against a part of it; and immediately after the War, against the spirit of blood feud. The stand was costly, but it prevailed, because reason and all that is best in human nature were bound to rally to it. To-day we are called to stand against that nation on behalf of another, whose motto our Shakespeare has written: 'Sufferance is the badge of all our tribe.' And once more, reason and true humanity will rally, not least I hope in Germany, against the ungrateful and unmanly persecution of an old and honoured race.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By the Reverend J. W. Jack, D.D., Glenfarg, Perthshire.

That the lion and the bear inhabited Palestine is inferred from the references to them in the Bible. But in far-off antiquity even the elephant and other giant animals roamed these regions. The geological section of the Wellcome-Marston Research Expedition, under Miss E. W. Gardner, which has been working at Bethlehem and other places, has discovered remains of elephants, panthers, antelopes, giraffes, rhinoceroses, hippopotami, hipparia (ancestors of the horse), and other wild animals. One of the most interesting finds at Bethlehem has been innumerable pieces of the shell of an enormous tortoise, which were found lying close together on a red pebbly bed. In the Huleh district, on the left side of the Jordan, where scientists from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem have been digging, there is evidence of the existence of elephants and other huge animals in the large number of tusks, bones, and molars discovered in the stratification (these were accompanied by flint implements of the Acheulean type). It is certain that elephants were known to the old inhabitants of Egypt, Palestine, and Assyria, by whom they were sometimes hunted for the sake of their ivory and their hides, and an elephant figures on the Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser III. (which reports the homage paid to Assyria by Jehu, King of Israel, and others in 841 B.C.). But it has not been known hitherto that other gigantic animals also stalked the land in far-off times. In Job 40[15-24] we have a description of 'behemoth' (an intensive Hebrew plural, meaning a 'colossal beast'), and in the next chapter of 'leviathan.' The former is generally supposed to be the hippopotamus, and the latter the crocodile, but the poetical writer seems to have added some traits from other monsters, or perhaps (as some scholars think) from the ancient Babylonian Creation myths.

Archæological discoveries in Mesopotamia within recent years have proved the existence of a whole millennium of civilization there before the historical era began (*c.* 3000 B.C.). In southern Mesopotamia this prehistoric epoch divides itself into three well-defined periods, which it is well to remember (we leave out the Tell Halaf Period which antedates them): (1) The *al-ʿUbaid Period* (so named from a site near Ur), lasting about six hundred years (from about 4000 to 3400 B.C.). It is characterized by painted pottery, much of it monochrome (pale greenish), and by stone implements, but engraving on seals was as yet unknown. (2) The *Urûk Period* (Urûk or Biblical Erech is modern Warka, a site excavated by the Germans). This period, dating from about 3400 to 3200 B.C., is characterized by three signs of progress—the invention of writing, the beginning of architecture (including the ziggurat and the column), and the use of seals. Painted pottery was abandoned in favour largely of a lustrous brick-red type, sometimes incised, and with long everted spouts and high handles. Instead of the ordinary seal, we later on find the cylinder, which was a short roller-like body, generally of stone or some hard composition, on the circumference of which some artistic object, usually some animal, was engraved. When the cylinder was rolled on the fresh clay of tablets, which the Mesopotamians used for writing, the object was neatly produced in relief. (3) The *Jemdet-Naṣr Period* (named from a site near Kish, south of Baghdad). This period, lasting from about 3200 to 3050 B.C., is distinguished by a return to painted pottery, of a polychrome nature. The ware is sometimes marked with horizontal lines near the top, and the decoration includes two red colours (vermilion and plum) as well as black and white, while the buff foundation colour makes a fifth. The shapes are those of the preceding period, but more elaborate, and the cylinders have representations not only of animals, but of geometric designs. The three periods referred to carry Mesopotamian prehistory up to what is known as the Early Dynastic Period. The Hebrews of the Old Testament do not appear on the scene till a thousand years later (*c.* 2100 B.C.), when Abraham and his Hebrew followers journeyed northward to Haran, and thence to Canaan.

While there is undoubtedly historic fact at the basis of the Biblical story of the Flood, some people seem to misunderstand the nature of the archæological discoveries at Ur and Kish, which go to support it. They do not appear to realize that the character and level of the diluvial deposit found at these two places differ considerably. The diluvial layer at Ur, which belongs to the al-ʿUbaid Period, is anterior by several centuries, perhaps by a thousand years, to that at Kish, and there is no sign, moreover, of any diluvial stratum at Warka (ancient Erech), Telloh (ancient Lagash), and other centres where it might be expected. At these places nothing interrupts the evolution commencing in the most ancient phase of the al-ʿUbaid Period, and continuing right on to the beginning of the Isin and Larsa dynasties, towards the twenty-third century before our era. It was probably, therefore, some local overflow of the Euphrates, or some change for a time in the river bed, that produced the diluvial strata at Ur and Kish. These successive, and no doubt overwhelming inundations, seem to have become magnified by tradition into a single and much wider catastrophe. Though fairly frequent in the course of the centuries (there are signs of three smaller Flood layers below the main one at Kish), they were doubtless of short duration, for the civilization above the clayey deposit at Ur is almost identical with that beneath.

Some further remarkable discoveries have been made in the last season's excavations at Mari (modern *Tell el-Ḫarîri*) on the middle Euphrates, where a powerful Semitic dynasty ruled in the third millennium B.C. In the palace there a huge painted panel (over eight feet long by nearly six high) containing two registers, an upper and a lower, gives in the upper one a picture of the king's investiture at the hands of the goddess Ishtar, and in the lower one a superb artistic picture of two goddesses (wearing three bracelets on each wrist) standing face to face, and each holding in her hand a 'flowing vase' containing a leafy plant. From each vase four streams of 'living water' gush forth, with fishes ascending and descending. The picture is clearly intended to signify the vitalizing powers conferred by divine beings. It has been thought by some to express the tradition of the four rivers issuing from Eden (Gn 2^{10}), but more probably it is a representation of 'living,' *i.e.* 'flowing' water, which stands so frequently in the Bible for the vivifying influences of God's grace (cf. Jer 2^{13}, Zec 14^{8}, Jn 4^{10}, etc.). We find similar representations on steles discovered at Gudea, Susa, and elsewhere, as well as on the cylinder of Ur-dun, and it is evident that this conception of life-giving mystic powers issuing from a divine source is a very ancient one. It is undoubtedly Semitic, though the adornments in the Mari palace, including the paintings and the frescoes with their spirals in imitation of marble, are clearly the work of Minoan artists. The same penetration of Cretan influence, indeed, has been found at Acbana and other places in Syria by Sir Leonard Woolley. The world was one, even in those far-off days.

In a previous article (December 1936) we gave an account of the explorations that were being undertaken at Tyre beneath the sea, to determine the nature and extent of the ancient harbours there. Further reports have now been made by A. Poidebard, the Director, acting under the Académie des Inscriptions. It is known that, long before the time of Joshua, Tyre was one of the most flourishing maritime centres of the ancient world, carrying on commerce with the distant regions of Babylonia, the Persian Gulf, the Red Sea, and other parts. One of its kings, Hiram, entered into a league with Solomon for commercial and other purposes. The two kings joined in an enterprise to send ships to Ophir, and perhaps also united in a coasting trade within the Mediterranean (cf. 1 K 10^{22}), in which case Tyre must have been the home port of some of the Hebrew king's vessels. The city, built on an island (now a headland), had two harbours, a northern and a southern. The latter, which was the chief one, appears to have been immense, and carefully protected by breakwaters, but little has been known about it till recently. Poidebard has employed every scientific assistance, including divers provided with cameras and with implements for submarine trench work, photography of the depths from aeroplanes, observation from the surface by means of a suitable telescope ('lunette de calfat') which could pierce to a depth of twenty metres, excavation on the shore where the ancient quays were, and other reliable means of investigation. The results go to support the view that the ancient southern harbour must have been one of the largest in the world. It was bounded by a mole, which touched the land at both ends, and had a narrow entrance in the middle. The mole was 850 metres long, and from seven to ten broad, constructed with great limestone blocks squarely cut and laid in courses beneath the water, and with rubble concrete on top (faced with similar blocks) above the usual sea-level. The harbour had two docks on the left side of the entrance, one polygonal and the other rectangular, and two on the right side, one polygonal and the other a dry-dock, laid with slabs, where vessels could be repaired. The quays were contiguous to the ancient town and were made of rubble concrete, with huge stone facings and with flagstone paving on top, but most of the remains of these have long since disappeared, having been utilized for building purposes in neighbouring towns, particularly Beirut. Outside the harbour, there was an immense roadstead where ships could ride safely at anchor, and which was formed by a breakwater jutting out two thousand metres into the open and built of stone blocks along a line of reefs, which are now in a state of disintegration. Parts of the breakwater were still visible as late as 1697, when they were noticed by the English traveller, Maundrell. The whole plan indicates that the ancient mariners of Tyre had taken every precaution against the winds and storms of the Mediterranean, and we need not wonder at their world-wide commercial success.

Some scholars have identified Kadesh-Barnea, where the Hebrews encamped before entering Canaan, with Petra rather than with *ʿAin Ḳedeis* (usually translated ' Holy Spring ') in the Negeb, about fifty miles south of Beersheba. Many travellers have visited the latter place and written largely on it. Père R. de Vaux, of the École Biblique at Jerusalem, who has recently explored the whole region, would not confine Kadesh-Barnea to *ʿAin Ḳedeis,* where there is considerable sterility and aridness, but would include the region to the north-west, especially *ʿAin Ḳedeirât* and its fertile valley. He states that much of the water that rises in this latter place (Lawrence found three large springs, each as thick as an arm) is being used in agricultural operations by means of canals and reservoirs, as there are numerous gardens, orchards, and cornfields in the vicinity. He found, however, one powerful spring untouched, which gushes through the solid rock on the level of the soil. There is an ancient fortress here, which may be one of the *migdols* erected in the Negeb by King Uzziah (2 Ch 26[10]), though it is known to have been constructed on the ruins of a previous stronghold in existence (some scholars believe) in early Israelite times. It is not unlikely that such a defence was required to guard the springs, especially as one of the ancient caravan routes from Gaza and Beersheba to the Red Sea passed down this way. Hiram and Solomon probably used this trade route to the Gulf, regarding it as a right-of-way from time immemorial, and one, moreover, that avoided the political frontier of Egypt. Père de Vaux found the *wādis* or valleys between *Ḳedeirât* and *Ḳedeis* partly cultivated, and it is interesting to note, in view of statements that the Israelites could not have subsisted here, that the tribes inhabiting the district are able to produce sufficient cereals for all their needs.

The Lachish Letters throw a useful light on the method of signalling between cities in Judah in time of siege or invasion. In Letter No. IV., sent (as all the letters appear to have been) from some observation post a few miles from Lachish, the writer states that he and his party were watching for the signals of this city, as they could not see those of Azekah. The word which he uses for ' signals ' (*masēth*) is the same as we find in Jer 6[1] (' raise up a signal on Beth-haccherem '). Such signals, seen many miles away, probably consisted of fire or smoke. Cf. Jg 20[38], ' Now the appointed sign between the men of Israel and the liers in wait was, that they should make a signal (*masēth*) of smoke rise up out of the city.' Pieces of wood, wrapped with some absorbent material and saturated in oil, were placed in a brazier or fire-pan on the city wall, and set aflame. In this way, by means of such flames, the fortified cities of Judah could communicate with Jerusalem and with each other in times of danger, just as beacons on successive hill-tops can carry a message through a whole land. At the time of the letters, the armies of Nebuchadrezzar were besieging Jerusalem, Lachish, and Azekah (587 B.C.).

The question as to where the outpost was from which the letters came is an interesting one. The terms of Letter IV. seem to show that it was nearer to Lachish than to Azekah. The position seems to correspond with ancient Mareshah, now known as *Tell Sandahannah,* which lies about three and a half miles north-east of Lachish, and eight miles south of Azekah (*Tell Zakariyeh*), and occupied a strategic position, adjoining the main route from Jerusalem to Eglon, and thence to Gaza and Egypt. It was a suitable place for a military observation post, as a party could easily be hidden in one of the extensive caves or rock-chambers with which the hill is riddled. If Mareshah be the same as Moresheth-Gath, as is generally believed among scholars, it was the home of the prophet Micah, and this would account for its pro-Jeremiah tendencies, so manifest in the letters, for Micah also proclaimed that Zion ' shall be plowed like a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps ' (Jer 26[18]). Professor Torczyner holding, as he does, that several of the letters concern Uriah, would locate the post at Kirjath-Jearim, this prophet's native town, but if this place be *Enab* or *Abu Ghōsh,* as seems likely, it is twenty-five miles distant from Lachish, and it would be impossible to distinguish signals so far away. Albright would place the post at *Tell Beit Mirsim* (Debir), but this location is ruled out by the fact that, according to Letter XVIII., the post was somewhere on the regular route from Lachish to Jerusalem.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

THIS[1] is the posthumous work of a distinguished scholar and thinker in Christian dogmatics and apologetics, and a highly honoured and much loved Christian personality in the œcumenical movements of Life and Work, and Faith and Order. The editor, Lic. Marie Horstmeier, one of his students, tells us that Arthur Titius 'stood in February 1935 at the beginning of the illness which led to his death on 7th September 1936 in the midst of comprehensive preparatory work for a philosophy of religion. This work he continued with his distinctive force of will, despite the severe hindrances, which his suffering brought. In the last months of his life he afforded me as one of his former students an insight into several completed chapters of the work, and gave me several indications of the structure which he intended.' Fitly his wife entrusted to her the task 'dear and honourable' of editing his unpublished manuscripts. His truly great work on *Natur und Gott* showed us the range of his learning and the keenness of his insight, his eminent fitness for such an undertaking; but alas! this slender volume of two hundred and thirteen pages comes to us as his legacy, and its quality makes sharper our distress at his loss. The number of subjects discussed briefly or at some length, disclosed in the Table of Contents, indicates how adequate would have been his treatment. Philosophy, psychology, sociology, anthropology, history of religions—all contribute to his Christian theism, and the latest literature is taken account of. He does not find it needful, as some of the passing theological fashions of the hour, to depreciate human reason that he may exalt divine revelation, or so to exaggerate the devastating effect of man's sin as virtually to banish God from the world which He has created. Yet he fully recognizes the uniqueness and the sufficiency of the divine revelation and human redemption in Christ. Two sentences may suffice. 'Only this can be said with certainty that, in so far as a real fulfilment of mankind lies in God's intention, it can be reached, not by its immanent development, but only through God's intervention' (p. 212). 'Thus is Jesus Christ to the common Christian faith not only the teacher of redemption, and the first who definitely entered into the full redemption of body and soul, but at the same time also the Incarnate Redeemer God, and all this together makes Him the Lord and Head of His community, but beyond this also the Saviour and Judge of all mankind in all ages' (p. 194). May this voice from the dead be a recall to the sanity as well as the sanctity of a reasonable Christian faith in Him in whom, because He is God's, we have all things.

This volume[2] is described as a *Study of the Hope of Jesus and of the Apostle Paul*. In the first part, entitled 'Jesus,' after a brief discussion of the problem of evil in Judaism, and the attitude of Jesus to it, the author accepts the eschatological conception of the Kingdom of God as that which Jesus preached, although admitting some anticipations of it, though invisible, from the beginning of His ministry. Jesus rejected the rôle of Messiah as a temptation, and believed in the advent of a Heavenly Man (the Son of Man, *Bar-nasha*) according to Daniel and Enoch, and his own future identity with him. Other eschatological conceptions—Messianic or non-Messianic—current in Judaism He set aside. The primitive Christian community, from religious and apologetic motives, regarded Jesus as having been raised to a spiritual Messianic dignity after His death. He Himself did not predict His resurrection, and the *fact* was the product of the *faith* of the community. (The author here accepts Goguel's conclusion.) Mark's Gospel presents a 'secret' Messiahship. In the second part the development in *Paul* of the two conceptions, the Heavenly Man and the Messiah is traced. To each of these a chapter is devoted. A third chapter combines the two in relating this Adamology to Soteriology. In the last chapter the significance of the Sacraments in relation to these conceptions is discussed.

This summary will indicate the unusual conclusions to which the writer comes in the first, and these conclusions affect the less unusual treatment in the second part. The argument is based on very radical criticism of the records of the Gospels. There is wide learning, and great skill in handling the abundant material. The Greek record of the teaching of Jesus is constantly being traced to the Aramaic original words, and contemporary Jewish ideas are cited as a guide to the interpretation of that teaching. The work would deserve a much more detailed discussion by a scholar more competent in this field of inquiry than I can claim to be; and I hope it may receive that attention. My own impression is that the data in the Gospels are often treated very arbitrarily; and that this critic, as so many others, is only too ready to dismiss as unauthentic what does not fit into his scheme. That Jesus rejected the current popular expectations, and even transformed the prophetic predictions of the Messiah, and was influenced in so doing by the picture of the Suffering Servant, seems to me a more probable assumption, doing less violence to the evidence. I am not convinced of the certainty of his identification of the Son of Man with the Heavenly Man, the second Adam. The Christology of the Primitive Church is here made a mythology, about the truth or falsehood of which even as symbolic of a reality of divine revelation or human redemption the author seems to be indifferent. He leaves us a problem of thought, not an object of faith. Alfred E. Garvie.

---

[1] *Beiträge zur Religionsphilosophie*, von D. Arthur Titius (Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1937).

[2] *Le Royaume de Dieu et sa Venue*, par Jean Héring, Docteur en Theologie (Librairie Felix Alcan, Paris; 50 francs).

London.

* * *

Just over a century ago there appeared the first volume of a very remarkable book by a Jewish writer. The title was 'Offenbarung nach dem Lehrbegriff der Synagoge,' and the author was Salomon Ludwig Steinheim, a medical man who spent most of his working life in Altona. Neglected by his contemporaries, and forgotten by his successors, he and his work have once more been brought to the front through the interest and enthusiasm of Hans Joachim Schoeps, who has issued a little book of extracts from Steinheim's work.[1] The selections are taken from several sources, an article written for a Jewish journal but not published by it is given in full. There are some pages from the 'Offenbarung' already mentioned, a few paragraphs from a novel, and some items of correspondence. They have been well chosen, for all reveal a striking and an attractive personality. The constant demand for an intelligible interpretation of faith, and the repeated appeal to reason have a distinctly modern tone, and it is impossible not to admire the author's wide learning, and the skill with which that learning is used. Steinheim was fully alive to the difficulties and dangers involved in the transition from one age in thought to another, and he made a serious attempt to meet them. This is, perhaps, the reason why Steinheim, unlike Moses Mendelssohn, has been almost forgotten, and students of modern Jewish thought have good reason for gratitude to Herr Schoeps for bringing his work once more to light.

The story of the Transfiguration is the subject of a monograph by a Roman Catholic scholar, Dr. Joseph Blinzler,[2] of Munich, forming the fourth part of the seventeenth volume in the series of *Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen*, edited by Dr. M. Meinertz. We have learnt to expect from German Catholics a very high standard of accuracy and thoroughness, and their reputation is fully maintained by this new book. The author first discusses the actual text of all the Biblical references to the Transfiguration, including 2 P $1^{16\text{ff.}}$, which he regards as embodying a genuine Petrine tradition, independently of the question as to the actual authorship of the Epistle as a whole. Here we have at once an illustration of the meticulous accuracy with which all the work of Dr. Blinzler is done; every detail in the text is discussed in order to establish, as far as possible, its original form. To the Biblical narratives is appended a short account of those which occur in various apocryphal books. Next comes a critical discussion of the relation between the three Synoptic accounts, leading to the conclusion that, while that of St. Matthew is dependent entirely on Mark, the Third Gospel shows signs of another source for the narrative. The question of earlier sources is then discussed, and an attempt is made to state the critical relation between the Synoptic narratives and the other references already mentioned. This part of the book concludes with a study of the literary peculiarities of the Gospel records and an estimate of their value as sources for history. All this may be regarded as preliminary to the discussions in the third part of the book, which deal with the character of the Transfiguration and with the credibility of the narratives. Under the first head Dr. Blinzler handles various attempts at rationalization of the story, either through its explanation as due to 'natural' causes, or by ascribing it to a subjective vision within the experience of the three Apostles. He also reviews theories which explain the story as an allegory or as a poetic doublet of the account of Peter's confession, and those which seek to prove that the narrative has been misplaced, and stood originally either after the Resurrection or before Peter's confession. Under the second head he disposes of attempts to describe the narrative as deliberate invention or as a piece of mythology, whether of Christian or of foreign origin.

---

[1] *Vom Bleibenden und Vergänglichen im Judentum* (Vortrupp Verlag, Berlin; R.M.2).

[2] *Die neutestamentlichen Berichte über die Verklärung Jesu* (Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Münster i. W; R.M.6.38).

The purpose of the author's work is frankly controversial; he feels himself faced with the theory that nothing 'supernatural' can be admitted into sober history, and that 'miracle' must be eliminated from reasonable belief. He admits that a discussion of this matter lies beyond the scope of his present study, but insists that only the strongest grounds can justify the rejection of the narrative as a piece of literal history. He is scrupulously fair to his opponents, stating their opinions with simplicity and moderation, and meeting them with straightforward reasoning, entirely free from abuse. Where he can approve of any point in their arguments he does not hesitate to say so, and carefully discriminates between the weaker and the stronger. His tone is a model for controversialists, and the work as a whole, by its methods, its comprehensive thoroughness, and its spirit, cannot fail to appeal even to readers who are not satisfied with Dr. Blinzler's conclusions.

T. H. Robinson.

Cardiff.

The Lord's Supper.

August Arnold has written a learned and well-documented work on the origin of the Lord's Supper, considered in the light of the most recent investigations in the realms of Liturgiology.[1] The monograph reveals a wide knowledge of Continental and British research, and is marked by wise critical discernment in the treatment and estimation of opposing views. Arnold considers first the relation of the Lord's Supper to analogous acts of religious fellowship in Judaism, in the Old Testament sacrificial meal, the *Chabûrôth* of later Judaism, the meals celebrated in connexion with the dead, the idea of the Messianic Banquet, and the Passover Meal. He devotes an especially full discussion to the views of Lietzmann (pp. 11–53), and gives good reasons for rejecting the hypothesis of a primitive Jerusalem type (illustrated by the *Didache* and the *Anaphora* of Serapion) which continued the *Chabûrôth* of Jesus and His disciples and was eventually replaced by the Pauline type. His discussion of the Passover Meal (pp. 57–83) should be read along with the valuable essay of Joachim Jeremias, *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu* (1935), for both studies illustrate a well-marked present tendency to identify the Supper with the Passover Meal and to trace a close connexion between the ideas and associations of the two. Besides considering the Supper as a sacrament, Arnold treats its significance as an offering, and examines closely the views of G. P. Wetter (pp. 84–110). His conclusion is that the origin of the Supper, both as sacrament and offering, cannot be found in the forms of Jewish piety, but that the links with Judaism are close. 'The Supper is nothing other than the Passover Meal of the New Covenent' (p. 112).

In Part II. Arnold investigates the Hellenistic parallels, and particularly those presented by the Mystery-religions (pp. 122–159). Rejecting dependence on the latter, he holds that the Eucharist has the character of a redemption-drama, or mystery, and to this extent he agrees with the views of Wetter, and still more wholeheartedly with those of O. Casel. The attitude of St. Paul, and his place in the alleged process of development, are discussed with much insight. Arnold does not think that the Liturgy of Hippolytus is a deviation from the traditional scheme, and, in consequence, he sees a further reason for rejecting the distinction of Lietzmann between a primitive and a Pauline type, and supports his claim by a careful expository treatment of 1 Co 11[23] and its context. The Mass, he contends, is not an isolated offering in the Old Testament sense, but the real remembrance of the one offering in the death of Christ. Its origins are not to be sought either in Jewish or in Hellenistic piety, but in the historic act of Christ at the Last Supper 'in the night in which he was betrayed.'

In Part III. it is argued that a study of the narratives of Institution in the New Testament supports the conclusions drawn from the liturgical evidence. The tone and spirit of these discussions are excellent. Even those who cannot agree with all that this able Roman Catholic scholar has written must agree that in this important work he has made a solid and permanent contribution to the classical literature of a supremely great theme.

* * *

A second edition of Friedrich Büchsel's *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; M.6 and 7.50) has quickly been found necessary. As this edition is substantially a reprint of the original edition, the reader may be referred to the earlier review in The Expository Times, xlviii. 183 f. There is a good deal to be said for a comprehensive survey of New Testament theology which separates the notes from the text. The student can study the notes during a second reading, and both he and the general reader can appreciate better the unity of the theme.

---

[1] *Der Ursprung des christlichen Abendmahls im Lichte der neuesten liturgiegeschichtlichen Forschung* (Herder, Freiburg im Breisgau; M.6.50).

Vincent Taylor.

Leeds.

Contributions and Comments.

Faith, Hope, Love—A Primitive Christian Triad.

How many of us realize that 'Faith, hope, love' is probably a very primitive Christian triad and not the creation of St. Paul?

Firmly linked, as it is, in our minds with the close of St. Paul's sublime hymn in praise of Love (1 Co 13^{13}) we are reluctant to admit that this triad is not an inspired *ipse dixit,* an original collocation of the Apostle himself. Yet several strands of evidence unite to prove that the triad is not Paul's own coinage, but a piece of pre-Pauline Christianity derived possibly from a saying of Jesus Himself.

The triad is found not only in 1 Co 13^{13}, but also in 1 Th 1^3 5^8, Ro 5^{1-5}, Gal 5^{5-6}, Col 1^{4-5}, Eph 4^{2-5}, He 6^{10-12} 10^{22-24}, 1 P $1^{3-8.\ 21-22}$, and once or twice in the Apostolic Fathers.

The following scheme shows how this triadic formula recurs, in various sequences, throughout early Christian literature:

1 Th 1^3 . .	Your work of faith and labour of love and patience of hope
1 Th 5^8 . .	The breastplate of faith and love . . . a helmet, the hope of salvation
Col 1^{4-5} . .	Faith in Christ . . . love to all . . . the hope which is, etc.
Eph 4^{2-5} . .	Forbearing one another in love . . . one hope of your calling . . . one Lord, one faith.
He 6^{10-12}. .	And the love . . . the fulness of hope . . . through faith, etc.
1 P 1^{3-8} . .	A living hope . . . guarded through faith . . . whom having not seen, ye love.
1 P 1^{21-22} .	So that your faith and hope . . . unto unfeigned love
He 10^{22-24} .	Fulness of faith . . . the confession of our hope . . . unto love
Gal 5^{5-6} . .	By faith wait for the hope . . . through love
1 Co 13^{13}. .	And now abideth faith, hope, love.
Ro 5^{1-5} . .	Justified by faith . . . the hope of the glory . . . because the love.
Barnabas 1^4	Because great faith and love dwell in you in the hope
Barnabas 11^8	In faith and love and hope for many.
Polycarp ad Phil $3^{2.3}$	Into the faith given you . . . when hope follows . . . and love of God and Christ and neighbour goes before.

N.B.—In the last five passages culled from the New Testament the same sequence of the Graces is observed by three different writers.

All this is surely not fortuitous. It strongly suggests that the triad in Paul is not his own creation, but something common and apostolic, perhaps a sort of compendium of the Christian faith current in the Early Apostolic Church.

Some incidental features in Paul's method of quoting the triad lend colour to this conjecture.

1. Consider how it crops up in 1 Co 13. Three points deserve notice. First, why does Paul drag in faith and hope at all at the end of his hymn in praise of love? The earlier verses of the chapter do not prepare us for their appearance here. The inference is that the mention of love suggested the other two members of what was already a traditional triad.

Second, Paul does not as a rule bracket faith and hope as of equal importance with love.

Third, the words 'these three,' following the mention of 'faith, hope, love,' suggest that it is a *familiar* triad. It is as if Paul says: 'Faith, hope, love—you know, the well-known three.'

2. Very significant is the almost tell-tale way in which Paul quotes the triad in 1 Th 5^8, 'Putting on the breastplate of faith and love, and for an helmet, the hope of salvation.'

The figure of the spiritual warrior and his panoply is, of course, old and Jewish. Compare Is 59^{17}, 'He put on righteousness as a breastplate, and an helmet of salvation upon his head.' Cf. also Wisdom of Solomon 5^{18}.

Now notice (in the Greek) the double genitive after 'breastplate' in 1 Th 5^{8}. The figure, to be perfect for Paul's purpose, would have named three pieces of armour—say, the breastplate of faith, the buckler of love, and the helmet of hope. Not finding the second piece of armour in the old metaphor, yet desiring to work in the three elements of his triad, Paul has to write, 'the breastplate of faith and love' and keep his second piece of armour for 'hope.'

But the phrase 'for an helmet, the hope of salvation' points to the same conclusion. The original figure spoke of 'a helmet of salvation' (as indeed we find it in Eph 6^{17}). To complete the triad Paul had to work in 'hope.' He did so, quite patently, by writing 'the hope of salvation' and putting 'for an helmet' in apposition to this phrase.

In fine, we have found St. Paul combining the old Jewish figure with the pre-Pauline Christian triad 'Faith, hope, love,' and seen how, with some difficulty, he achieves the combination.

Our last problem is this: Where, if St. Paul did not invent the triad, did it originate?

Most scholars are content to call it traditional and speculate no further. But there is, in my judgment, good reason for thinking that the triad was inspired by a saying of our Lord.

Macarius, in one of his Homilies (xxxvii), has preserved a remarkable agraphon which I may translate: 'Hearing the Lord saying, Take care of *faith* and *hope* through which is begotten the *love* of God and of man which gives eternal life.' Is it rash to find in this uncanonical saying of the Lord the original of the triad?

We do not find anything in the Synoptic Gospels quite parallel to this saying. There ἀγάπη (love) occurs only twice. But its use in these two places (as Resch has pointed out) though probably quite accidental, is nevertheless interesting. In Lk 11^{42} we find ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ, love in its Godward aspect, which answers almost exactly to ἡ φιλόθεος ἀγάπη the phrase in Macarius. In Mt 24^{12} we find ἡ ἀγάπη τῶν πολλῶν, love in its manward aspect which again recalls ἡ φιλόθεος ἀγάπη in Macarius.

This is surely only a coincidence. I do not press it. But I do think that the two-fold chain of evidence formed by (1) the recurrence of the triad in Paul, Peter, Hebrews, etc., and (2) the remarkable saying attributed by Macarius to the Lord, strongly suggests that this triadic formula is not only a bit of very early Christianity but may very possibly be derived from a logion of Jesus.

One word more. Faith, hope, love—these were, apparently, vastly important words in the earliest Christian vocabulary. The Christians had baptized them into new meanings in the light of the gospel revelation. If we could define precisely the content of each of these terms in the first two or three decades of the Christian era, we should penetrate right to the heart of earliest Christianity. What ideas, what associations did the word 'faith' evoke in the mind of one of these first Christians? Nowadays we do not in popular speech draw a hard and fast line of demarcation between it and 'hope,' the second member of the triad. But assuredly the early Christians did. For 'hope' in the New Testament is not just a vague confidence that things will somehow or other improve. It is always religious hope. It is hope which rests not on man but on God, and especially on what God has done for man in Christ. It is the hope of salvation which is founded upon the God who raised Jesus from the dead. And what of 'love'? But I do not intend to enter into the problem further here. I would merely point you to St. Paul's own exegesis of the triad in Col 1^{4-5}, 'having heard of your faith in Christ Jesus, and of the love which ye have toward all the saints, because of the hope which is laid up for you in the heavens.' If, as I do believe, there is much more that is common and apostolic in Paul's thinking and theology than much past criticism has divined, we may conjecture that in his exegesis of the triad he is reproducing the usual connotations given to these three words and not merely interpreting them according to the thought of St. Paul.

A. M. HUNTER.

Mansfield College, Oxford.

John iv. 44.

THE merit of my suggestion (in the November number) was that, by transposing v.^{46} only, 'his own country' can naturally be referred to Nazareth. The drastic reconstruction proposed (in the February number) by Mr. Johnson apparently makes it apply to Capernaum. How can this be justified? Further, so far from 'restoring complete lucidity and coherence' his transposition of 2^{1-12} produces incoherence; 1^{43} says, 'On the morrow he willed to go forth into Galilee' to which the marriage in Cana gives the natural sequel. But Mr. Johnson removes both this and the visit to the Passover

2[13]–3[21]; thus the purpose of Jesus to go into Galilee is not recorded as fulfilled, but leads straight up to 3[22], 'After these things came Jesus and His disciples into the land of Judæa.'

W. A. WORDSWORTH.

Hindhead, Surrey.

Romans xii. 16; 1 Corinthians xiii. 7.

Ro 12[16]: μὴ τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονοῦντες, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι. The last three words have been variously rendered—'condescend to men of low estate' (A.V.); 'condescend to things that are lowly' (R.V.); 'carried along with humble tasks' (Sanday-Headlam). Elsewhere (Gal 2[13], 2 P 3[17]) the verb means 'carried away by' some (wrong) influence, and since this is quite inappropriate here, and the other meanings forced upon it by the translators have no authority, it is only reasonable to suppose that the form has suffered corruption. Mr. R. M. Gwynn has suggested συναγαπώμενοι, but I should prefer συνυπαγόμενοι, 'subjecting yourselves.' As regards the gender of τοῖς ταπεινοῖς, I would follow A.V. in taking it as masculine rather than neuter, because the word is regularly used of persons in the N.T., so that the meaning of the three words will be 'sharing the subjection (or lowly estate) of the humble.'

1 Co 13[7]: πάντα στέγει . . . πάντα ὑπομένει. 'Beareth all things . . . endureth all things' (A.V. and R.V., with 'covereth' in R.Vm.). This tautology is scarcely tolerable. Moreover, in 1 Co 9[12] 'beareth' seems an inadequate rendering of στέγω which elsewhere (1 Th 3[1.5]) is rendered (in A.V. and R.V.) 'forbear.' I suggest, therefore, that we should read στέργει, 'is content with,' 'acquiesces in' (as opposed to a grasping, grumbling spirit).

R. G. BURY.

Cambridge.

Entre Nous.

A. E. Whitham.

There was to have appeared in this month's EXPOSITORY TIMES an article on worship by Mr. A. E. Whitham. Just before he became seriously ill he had started on it and it must surely have been the last literary work he tried to do. And now, so soon, we have a memorial volume, compiled from his writings—*The Discipline and Culture of the Spiritual Life* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). In reading it we feel afresh what we have lost by his passing. The extracts, each making a chapter, have been excellently chosen to show the scope of his work. They are arranged under large subject headings—'The God We Worship,' 'True Religion.' 'The Church and the Creeds,' 'Our Manifold Temptations,' 'Our Responsibilities as Christians,' 'The Devotional Life,' 'At Special Seasons,' and 'The Victory of Faith'—so that we have a feeling of continuity and completeness in reading. There is a charming Introduction, 'My Father,' by his daughter, Fiona Mary Whitham. In a few deft, tender touches she paints such a picture that we feel we see and know him. 'Saint Augustine said: "Love God, and then do what you like." If it were possible in one phrase to sum up my father's attitude to life it would be this, which he himself used frequently. He loved God, and in the strength of that love lived gloriously.

'At an early age we, his daughters, were thrilled by his joyous interest in everything. . . .

'He was truly a master in the art of living, and it was exhilarating to see him give himself fully and vigorously to that art. His poise was remarkable: his catholicity of mind, his genius for friendship, his patience in his dealings with folk who tried him sorely, his unforgettable humour.

'His desire for us when we were young was that we should be reasonable. I can hear him now saying to us: "Be reasonable, my dears, be reasonable," and our laughter as he worked himself into a quite unreasonable fervour about it. . . .

'One of his last words to me—though we did not know it then—was: "He has the hammer that can strike my bell." It was to have been the subject of his last sermon on Christmas morning, but he was not well enough to give it. But that was the thought which shone in his mind at the last, and I know of no more fitting note on which to close: *He has the hammer that can strike my bell.*'

This is a volume that can be read straight through, for Mr. Whitham had the great gift of easy, flexible writing. But it is a volume to be read again, chapter by chapter, for it is full of hard, sustained thought. It is a book for to-day for Mr. Whitham could say, 'I am deeply contented with my faith, more deeply as the years pass and I see the waxing and waning of all other ingenious and pathetically strained substitutes. In the midst of the questions that plague the mind, I have a joy that intensifies with the years.'

A Miracle in the Usual.

'The adventure is in our own street, the romance at the door, the colour at our feet, the wonder in the common-place—"for there is no such thing as an uninteresting subject, only an uninterested person." There is a miracle in the usual, a sublimity in simple loyalties, and a stage for divine drama, though the stage be as narrow as Palestine and as cramped as a cross. Christ was tempted to the unusual when the suggestion came to turn stones into bread. He was tempted to the astonishing with the thought of casting Himself down from a pinnacle of the temple. He was tempted to the revolutionary romantic when, for a nod to Satan, kingdoms and powers might be won, and He turned from these enticements to read a lesson in the synagogue, to bear with men like Peter, Judas, and Thomas, to be the confidant of such women as the woman of Samaria, to play the guest to Zaccheus and the host to fishermen, to wash the feet of men, and die on a cross, not as a hero even to His own friends, but as an outcast and criminal.' [1]

Human Brotherhood.

'We think we know certain things until some one asks us about them, and then we find we don't know. . . . So with regard to our beliefs. We think we understand Christianity. We take it for granted that we believe in Christian things. The Bishop of Manchester, in his little book written for Lenten meditation, gives an incident from the War. An officer at mess was saying, "What does this fellow Wilson want to butt in for with his beastly League of Nations?" Here in his excitement the officer knocked over a glass. "Oh, damn! Sorry, padre. What I mean is I cannot stick all this blether about human brotherhood." The Chaplain, as officially representing the Church of God, was supposed to feel shocked at hearing the word "damn," and was entitled to an apology, but it was not thought that he would expect an apology for blasphemy against the very heart of the Gospel he was commissioned to preach. Doubtless that young officer thought he knew something about Christianity, and might have felt insulted if you had called him a heathen, yet he did not know the ABC of it.' [2]

Cure of Souls.

It is time to think of holiday reading and here is just the book to take with us. It is *Thirty-Five to Fifty*—a collection that Dr. Albert Peel has made from his own writings. Whatever subject Dr. Peel writes on—and there is a great variety here—he is interesting. There are chapters on 'Statesmen and Scholars,' 'Pastor and People,' 'Men and Books,' 'Work and Play,' and his favourite recreation, 'Cricket.' The volume is published by the Independent Press at 5s. Perhaps we might say, too, that the whole appearance of the volume is most attractive. Writing on 'The Cure of Souls,' Dr. Peel stirs us to anxious thought. Here are a couple of paragraphs.

'One day the Master of a Poor Law Institution wrote to tell me of the funeral of one of the inmates, an old man nearly eighty. He thought I should like to know because "the deceased had left in writing that you were his nearest and best friend." How those words hurt! The old man came to worship on Sunday mornings, I had spoken to him perhaps a dozen times—and I was "his nearest and best friend!" God forgive me because I had not learnt more about him, and helped him more. A deacon and I went to his funeral. We were the only mourners: the old man was buried in a public grave, in a mound with many others several feet above the surrounding ground—one whom time had left derelict and friendless, loved by the Great Shepherd of the sheep if under-shepherds failed.

'Looking back on a ministry in a large and busy church, I am convinced that, as at present organized, such churches cannot but fail in "the cure of souls." It was a man wise in the things of the Kingdom who said centuries ago that "A soul is diocese enough for any one man." What are the limits of a congregation which can be a true church, in which the members can know and help each other, and the minister have time for "the cure of souls"? I should say, at the very outside, a hundred families, and if the work of shepherding is to be effectively done, probably forty or fifty is nearer the mark.'

We must Begin.

'A story of the Prince of Wales—probably familiar by this time, and certainly good enough to be true—relates that on his American trip his medical adviser became anxious about his jaded appearance. Knowing that the Prince was unlikely to accede to a request that he should retire from a dance, the doctor spoke to the orchestra, and said, "I want to get the Prince to bed early to-night.

---

[1] A. E. Whitham, *The Discipline and Culture of the Spiritual Life*, 73.

[2] *Ibid.* 59.

At midnight will you please play the National Anthem?" The orchestra did as requested, and when the last strains of "God Save the King" died away, the Prince jumped on a chair and said, "Now we've put father to bed, we'll begin!"

'Now, we have no wish to "put father to bed," but *we must begin*. We do not despise the accumulated wisdom of the past, but we must build on it; we must employ it in business, not live on it as capital.' [1]

This God a Fascist.

In his volume of reminiscences, *How I Found My Faith*, just published by Messrs. Cassell, Dr. Rhondda Williams of Brighton has something worthwhile to say on a misleading theory of Guidance. 'The function of religion is not to lighten the intellectual or the moral burden, but to enable us to carry them. The God in this theory is a Fascist. He does not want us to think for ourselves, but only to ask Him for our orders, and give them blind obedience. I do not believe in such a God. I believe the God who gave us our faculties meant us to use them.

'It is not to mental bankrupts the God of Christianity reveals Himself. And the soft talk about abstaining from "criticism," which really means not merely from carping criticism which we always knew to be bad, and not merely from analytic discussion which we know cannot fully measure reality, but from sober thought and discriminating judgment without which one cannot live a wise life, is unworthy of our creation as rational beings. Whatever comes to us as from the Spirit of God must be submitted as best we can to moral tests.

'Otherwise we are simply subjects in a Fascist State in which moral development is arrested, and intellectual sincerity made impossible. I want a God who will help me to think, not a God who does my thinking for me. If we honestly think that acting upon an impulse will be for good, let us act upon it. We shall thus be doing our best. We cannot be infallible for the simple reason that God made us fallible. In doing our best we may make mistakes, but an honest mind and a clean heart will carry us through all our mistakes into a wiser and safer life.'

Better Dead.

The *St. Martin's Review* is giving a page every month during 1938 to quotations from Dr. H. R. L. Sheppard's writings. This is part of the May extract:

'Our Lord promised a great reward to those who receive a prophet in the name of a prophet. Most of us have no hesitation in receiving a prophet, always provided that he is dead. A prophet living is an uncomfortable being; he makes no allowance for people who want a quiet life; besides, he has an uncompromising way with him, and no reverence for expediency. But, being dead, he can be honoured safely; no fresh word or challenge can come from him; he can be hailed as a prophet, and his tomb can be reared. It is easier to build the tombs of the martyrs, than to share the flames with them. But the counsel to receive a prophet in the name of a prophet—for the prophet that he is—can only apply to the treatment of *the prophet alive*. Our Lord set no store by sentimental dreamings; it was in a living and active faith He took delight. . . . To receive a living prophet in the name of a prophet means—obedience to his message. And it is there that we hang back. Now we shall not be judged in the end of things by our attitude towards ancient choices, or dead prophets. It is here and now that we must take sides not in old forgotten battle-scenes or in abandoned trenches, not under captains no longer in the field, but under captains with a challenge for living men. There or nowhere shall we win our souls.'

The Scottish Sabbath.

The *British Weekly* reports that the King and Queen have lent for the historical display in the Scottish Pavilion at the Empire Exhibition at Glasgow a unique clock which was the wedding gift from the citizens of Glasgow to their Majesties in 1923.

The clock was made in 1804 by a clockmaker in Pittenweem, and is regarded as one of the most remarkable ever produced in this country. There is a carillon of sixteen bells, and from beneath one of its three dials comes a Royal procession and a troop of Horse Guards. But the mechanism of the clock is so geared that there is no march or procession on Sundays, in keeping with the tradition of the old Scottish Sabbath.

---

[1] Albert Peel, *Thirty-Five to Fifty*, 15.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

In his Kerr Lectures, *Revelation and Response*, reviewed in another column, Professor E. P. Dickie of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, offers a study of the much-canvassed topic of 'The Finality of the Christian Religion.' Part of the study we should like to put before our readers in summary form.

The claim of finality which he would consider is not one for the absoluteness of dogma, nor for the absoluteness of any particular Church. It is for the absoluteness of the faith as it is given in Christ. It is part of the evidence of this absoluteness, he says, that the response to the authority of Christ and the apprehension of His truth have followed different ways and assumed varied forms both in individuals and in churches.

It may be objected that the supreme revelation in religion will come, if at all, not in the course of history but at the end of it. But in art the supreme revelation may come in the course of the series. It has been well said, 'No artist will ever surpass Pheidias—for progress exists in the world, but not in art.' It has also been well said, 'We reach in Bach, in principle, the highest point in music.' No more need finality wait in religion for the end of time.

It may be suggested that Christianity, so far from being the final revelation of God, has been outrivalled already by one of the other known religions.

Take Islam. Allah is no doubt One and Omnipotent, but He is so remote from the world that His will becomes almost the equivalent of blind destiny. His will is everything; man's life is nothing —'rotten rags and dirt.' On such a presupposition the idea of God as a loving Father can have no proper place in the Muslim mind.

Take Buddhism. Life is regarded as nothing but illusion and the wretchedness of desire, and redemption is not redemption of life but redemption from life. And it is achieved through knowledge. Where Christianity calls for repentance, Buddhism advocates illumination. And where Christianity promises a life of fellowship with God beyond the grave, Buddhism perhaps goes no further than to say that Nirvana is the peaceful end beyond the dread of rebirth.

Take Hinduism. It has been said that Hinduism has developed an attitude of 'comprehensive charity.' There ought, however, to be two stubborn limits to all-comprehending tolerance. The first is truth, and the second morality. And Hinduism is deficient both in intellectual earnestness and in moral illumination and moral drive. It may be pointed out in the latter connexion that the unreality of the world to the Hindu mind leads to the denial of human freedom and responsibility.

It may also be suggested that we should seek an amalgam of the best elements in all the known faiths. But it is not syncretism that has preserved the supernatural from oblivion. A true religion, moreover, is an organic unity, and it may not be dissected into parts without destroying the life of the parts. The Christian life and character, for

Vol. XLIX.—No. 10.—July 1938.

which some would claim finality, cannot be separated from the Christian faith.

Because Christians have received their idea of God from the teaching and the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus, they know that there are definite 'limits of syncretism.' Deny the existence of these limits and you deny the Christian idea of God. Deny the absoluteness of Christianity and you deny Christianity itself. But is there anything greater than holy divine love as seen in Jesus? The redemption which is offered by Christ leaves no profound and legitimate longing unfulfilled.

There was a time when Natural Religion was in the ascendant and it was confidently believed that a true and sufficient knowledge of God could be attained by the unaided exercise of reason contemplating the data given in the natural and moral world. Roman Catholic theologians also give a high place to reason as being sufficient of itself to establish on a firm logical basis at least a theistic, if not a Christian faith. On the contrary, the Barthian school tends to depreciate reason and to set little value upon its testimony in these high regions, deeming it to be blinded and incapacitated by sin.

To most minds it will probably seem well to assume that the world will have something to tell of its Maker and will bear such traces of His handiwork as will throw some light upon His character and purpose. On this theme the Very Rev. W. R. MATTHEWS, Dean of St. Paul's, recently gave a series of wireless talks which have now been published under the title of *Signposts to God* (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net). These talks are most admirable in their clearness and simplicity combined with a fine persuasiveness which must have commended them to many hearers.

First of all, there are certain signposts in Nature. Not that these signposts are as clear as one could wish. The inconceivable vastness of the universe and the prevalence of suffering in it might be interpreted to mean that it was utterly indifferent to us or even hostile. But, on the other hand, the supreme impression which Nature makes on the mind is of overwhelming splendour and glory. There are moments when you catch your breath at the loveliness, and then 'one has the impression, difficult to define, that the landscape is trying to say something, that it is expressing some meaning or some emotion, which could not be put into words, though poets sometimes get near to it and it can be, in part, translated into music. . . . Shall we say that poets are simply fanciful persons who obscure the truth? We should be very foolish if we did, for the poetical mind is one way of apprehending Reality, and we shall not know Nature as it truly is if we do not give due weight to the poets' report of it.' The mind readily responds to the sentiment expressed in Addison's great hymn:

> The spacious firmament on high,
> With all the blue ethereal sky,
> And spangled heavens, a shining frame,
> Their great Original proclaim.

Further, we have to consider what science emphatically teaches, that we ourselves are part of Nature. 'It is an admitted fact that Nature has produced mind, that in Nature we find beings with the capacity to think about Nature and to understand it.' This is a very significant fact, and not to be lightly explained away by saying that Nature has the potentiality of producing mind. The question is: How does Nature come to have that potentiality? The answer which some of the world's greatest thinkers have given seems to be the only satisfactory one, namely, that Nature produces mind because it never was without mind. 'The picture which we form of Nature as a mindless, impersonal, unheeding process or machine is an illusion which arises because we think of Nature as if mind were not included in it. In short, it seems that a consideration of Nature as a whole and not one mutilated aspect of it suggests that mind was with it and in it all the time, and supports the wonderful saying of St. John: "In the beginning was the Word or thought".'

Next we may read signposts to God in history.

The record here is interminable and confusing beyond words, yet we refuse to believe that it is 'a tale told by an idiot.' We feel that it has significance. Something, we are sure, is going on. There is not only movement but progress. This, by the way, is really a Christian conception. It stands in sharp contrast to the view held by ancient and by eastern thinkers that the movement is circular. Viewing the revolutions of the heavens and the succession of the seasons, it was natural enough to suppose that the history of the world was a succession of cycles, like the turnings of a wheel. But we in this evolutionary age have a rooted conviction that something is going on.

What is going on? Man is working out his destiny. 'Humanity is the true and only hero of history, and the writing of any history, even the most limited in scope, is an attempt to add a chapter or a footnote to the adventure of the human race.' Man is free and has a destiny. There could be no interest in the story of an automaton. The Hebrew prophets were the first great men to think seriously about man's destiny, and there is profound truth in their conviction that history is the judgment of God upon nations. 'The great civilizations and empires which have arisen have fallen by many contributory causes, but invariably they seem to have decayed from within. . . . The judgment of history is, at least partially, a moral judgment.'

It would appear then that the goal of history is to be found in the fulfilled destiny of man, a fulfilment which seems to point beyond time. In this connexion, the turning-point of history is manifestly the coming of Jesus Christ. Nothing has been the same since. 'Ever since that beginning in Galilee there has hovered before the minds of men the ideal of the Kingdom of God. For this reason Christendom has been the most restless, the most changeful, and the most progressive of all civilizations. Always the contrast between what they have and the Kingdom of God has awakened in men a longing for what they feel is their true home.' And so history, with Christ in its midstream, becomes a signpost pointing to God and heaven.

Another notable signpost is conscience, or, more generally, the moral life. The authority of conscience has been challenged on the ground that it speaks with different voices in different people, and that its origin is very lowly. Doubtless its origin is lowly, and as John Knox said to Mary Queen of Scots: 'Conscience, Madam, requires knowledge.' But we have to judge conscience by what it has become in the best of men, and we find among them a most impressive consensus about right and wrong. The significant fact is that in every human breast there is a voice which commands and forbids, which praises or condemns.

What does this point to? 'We seem to be led to the idea that there are two selves in question —what we call our ordinary self, largely governed by habit and convention, and a higher self, which steps in now and then and claims to take charge of the situation.' But we must go further if we are to acquit the man of conscience of being merely self-opinionated and stubborn. He acts on the conviction that in being true to his higher self he is also being loyal to a Divine Will. Thus conscience is our most valuable signpost to God. It indicates, more than do the others, 'not only that God is but *what* He is. We have a clue to His character, which perhaps was lacking in Nature and history. He is the meaning of the world, the source of the good which the saints and heroes see and serve, the ground of their assurance and the goal towards which they strive.'

There are also signposts to God of another sort which speak with the voice of authority. Many resent the very name of authority in religion. The only authority, they say, is truth. Let that be cordially granted, but consider to what an extent we depend on authority in every sphere of life. We simply could not live unless we accepted the testimony of others who have discovered or tested things for us. The strictest scientist cannot verify everything for himself. He builds on the work of his predecessors and accepts the evidence of experts in other fields. It is utterly senseless, therefore, for any man to say: 'I will listen to no authority.

I will think my own religion out for myself.' 'He is bound to end with a terribly meagre and shallow creed, for one very obvious reason. He has left out most of the data. He has not got the material for an answer. Does he suppose that the essential facts about the world are all disclosed to his own limited consciousness, or that his experience is equivalent to all the experience available?'

Any man of sense, conscious of his own limitations, will be profoundly impressed by the whole long history of religion in the world, and will hesitate long before he sets it down as only a vast illusion. Especially he will feel that the Hebrew religion, recorded in the Old Testament, with its complement and fulfilment in the New Testament, is profoundly significant. Then, 'there is a kind of authority in religion which is rather like the authority of the people who appreciate art or music. . . . There seem to be persons who have a peculiar sensitiveness to the spiritual world. These are the creative individuals in the history of religion.' They give a confident witness that they are in touch with God, and their witness is not lightly to be set aside. A similar authority belongs to the Bible which records such testimonies, and to the Church which enshrines and interprets them. They each in their own way witness to the Divine truth. And perhaps the most impressive thing is that they all point in the same direction, and when taken together they give a convergent testimony which presses with convincing force upon the candid mind.

In the published volume of his recent broadcast talks, *The Christian Faith* (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net), the Rev. J. S. Whale, President of Cheshunt College, has a suggestive chapter on the Parable of the Importunate Seeker, or of the Churlish Neighbour, in the eleventh chapter of Luke, which is a very good example of exposition at its best. The baffling thing about the story is that it is followed by the exhortation, 'I say unto you, Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened to you,' as though the story meant: if man will not resist such persistence indefinitely, neither will God; that prayer means pestering God, keeping at it shamelessly until our requests are granted. Is this the thing Jesus wanted men to learn when they said to Him, Lord, teach us to pray?

President Whale puts this idea aside as a 'degraded and degrading contention,' and proceeds to set forth what he conceives the teaching of the Parable to be. First of all, he reminds us of the fact, which we should never forget, that Jesus was, among other things, a poet and an artist. The Parables are works of art, and should be approached as such. They are not allegories, every detail of which is meant to have its interpretation. We have to look at the story as we look at a canvas by Rembrandt. Rembrandt will darken heavily every part of a head in order that one spot on its brass helmet may stand out brilliantly. But he does not thereby imply that the wearer of the helmet is a black man.

And surely when Jesus tells stories which perplex us because of the dark places in them; when in one parable an unjust judge seems to stand for God and in another an unjust steward for a disciple; and when here a surly, ill-mannered man points by analogy to God, and when, apparently, intercession is likened to begging—ought we not to remember the way of the artist? The point is, how does the judge *act*? What does this neighbour, hearing the cry for help, *do*? Jesus, being a great teller of stories, does what only great masters can do with power; He deliberately gives to His story colour and high lights against a background uncompromisingly dark; He dares to bring out rightness of action by setting even wrongness of character in vivid contrast.

He is painting a picture with importunity as its theme, and if there is to be a picture at all, it will give us analogies, not of character but of action. Surely the high light in this picture is not those details which are trivial and unedifying enough in themselves; the vital point on which all the light of the picture is focussed, so that it is withdrawn from elsewhere, is that God does hear the importunate cry of man for His care and blessing.

If there is a dark shadow in the picture it is there only to show the ultimate secret of this universe in one luminous detail—bread being given, human need being met, by the manna of God's grace.

But, to get to the meaning of the story, it brings right home to us a fact which has to be disturbingly, arrestingly forced upon our notice, since we are so prone to ignore it. The deep root of all our modern problems is that we do not really believe in God. We may believe half-heartedly in the *idea* of God, as a hypothesis with which to make sense of our lives. But that is theism; it is a belief about God, but not yet belief in God, the living God who is known for what He is by what He does in history, and in our history. We have profoundly forgotten everywhere what it is to believe in Providence, Miracle, and Prayer. This Parable, with its naïve and unphilosophical picture of living communion between God and man, pulls us sophisticated people up with a jerk. We theorise about religion. Jesus lived religion. He lived in and with God. He was completely and profoundly simple in His certainty about God.

Jesus knew that He had come to mediate this knowledge to needy men and to make its redeeming power operative in their lives. But to us, is not God too often a faltering hypothesis? We speculate, we wonder, we argue about Him. We spend so much time in these days of disintegration discussing wistfully whether God may not, after all, be only the pathetic product of our imagination. This Parable, which likens the deepest things in religion to running round the corner to ask help from a neighbour forces us to see that argument about religion is not religion.

There is to-day a great deal of what John Smith, the Cambridge Platonist, called 'this hovering and fluttering up and down about divinity.' There is a great deal of intellectual anxiety about the problems of religion. And, of course, the problems are there and are inescapable. But what Jesus suggests is that you can only know God by going down on your knees. Apart from this all our argumentation is the empty clamour of words, rather than silence and awe before the majesty and comfort of the Word of God: much rattling of milk-cans but little milk: much talk of food values, vitamins and diet analysis, but little living bread into which a man can get his teeth and so sustain his very life. It is all the difference between lingering at home, uncertain whether our neighbour might let us have a loaf to meet our immediate need, and going and getting it from him.

And there is a final thing in this Parable which is the dominant truth of the whole matter. The Parable turns on the word importunity, the word which is the undoing of many who read it. What are we to make of it? In a sentence the meaning seems to be that this God and Father of Jesus Christ and of us all can help us only when we go to Him demanding His help. Even God cannot feed us with the bread of life unless we go to Him with open mouths. Forcible feeding and freedom cannot go together. Only those who hunger and thirst after God can be filled of God—if man is truly free and if God is love. And the story of the surly neighbour who holds back for a time, though not edifying in detail, is most certainly edifying as the mirror of an eternal truth.

Christian history in all its range and variety is a commentary on what Jesus was here proclaiming. Listen to Martin Luther on the 118th psalm: 'The psalmist said: I cried unto the Lord. Thou must learn to cry. Come now, thou lazy rascal, fall down upon thy knee and set forth thy need with tears before God.' You can have God's gift of Himself only as you greatly desire it: as you ask, seek, knock. We find this Parable difficult because its details are difficult. But see it in terms of the spiritual order to which it points. In that spiritual order you can have only what you desire earnestly. Importunity is the only key which will open the door of that world. God has put the door there, not that you may be denied admission, but that by knocking and demanding you may know how blessed a thing it is to enter in. In reverence be it said that only by assault upon Himself can we receive the things which God prepares eternally for them that love Him.

Why Don't We Preach the Apocalypse?

By Professor J. Hugh Michael, M.A., D.D., Emmanuel College, Toronto.

In view of the present state of world affairs do we preachers avail ourselves as we might of the material that is at our disposal in the Apocalypse of John? What means I have of judging would seem to show that the use of the book in modern preaching is slight. Having regard to the applicability of its contents to the present condition of things this is difficult to understand. Its neglect involves to my mind a real impoverishment of the preaching of to-day.

Is there at the back of our mind, I wonder, a fear that the interest which might be aroused by a more general use of the book would tend to strengthen the hold of apocalyptic ideas upon the people? We do well to deprecate any such happening, for Apocalyptic, in spite of a magnificent faith in God, is often in reality a denial of the efficacy of the spiritual endowments with which we must carry on the work of God in the world. We soon discover, however, that the apocalyptic form of John's great poem is to a large extent merely the framework of his real message. Its apocalyptic character is no reason for the neglect of the book, but rather a reason for care and wisdom in its exposition.

The exuberant imagery of the book should be a help to the preacher, as it enables him to introduce the discussion of deep and vital themes with the help of arresting pictures. The symbolism is indeed often fantastic and grotesque, but that only shows that the writer's real interest is in the truth that is symbolized. The grotesqueness of a picture does not affect John's message, but it may well serve to arrest the attention of our hearers. And it behoves us to remember that a symbol is often nearer to the truth, and better able to convey the truth, than exact and minute statements and definitions.

It is the analogous situation obtaining to-day that should make the preaching of the Apocalypse vital and effective; for when history reproduces the conditions under which the book was written its teachings inevitably acquire a special significance. Such conditions always tend to stimulate apocalyptic hopes and expectations, and this in itself increases the responsibility of teachers and preachers to direct attention to the nature and the applicability of the spiritual message of the book.

Modern criticism has definitely returned to the view held by Irenæus and other early Fathers that the Apocalypse as we have it was issued in the dark days of persecution towards the close of the reign of Domitian. Its grim background is the worship of Rome and the Emperor. The Church of John's day was faced by a totalitarian State demanding and enforcing the worship of the dictator in whom its power was symbolized and concentrated. Ch. 13 with its two Beasts, representing respectively the Roman Power and the Priesthood of the Cæsar Cult, might well supply the basis of an introductory sermon setting forth the background of the book. Not soon would a congregation forget the predicament of the churches of Asia once it had been vividly set before them by the aid of the graphic pictures of that chapter.

To dilate upon the closeness of the modern parallel would be superfluous. Certain modern States are replicas of the Roman Power as it confronted John and his readers. The totalitarian State of to-day demands worship as truly as Rome ever did. Communism and Fascism are religions. 'Communism,' says Barth, 'is a religion the like of which has perhaps not been seen in opposition to Christianity since the days of early Islam.' And in a recent issue of the *Hibbert Journal* Professor R. B. Mowat writes: '"Eternal Rome" and "Eternal Germany" are the modern versions of Divus Cæsar; and the apotheosis of the State in Fascist or National-Socialist ideology is the Roman Emperor Worship of the first three centuries A.D. resurgent in the twentieth century. Most of the early Christian martyrs suffered because they would not acknowledge the divinity of the Emperor. The modern martyrs suffer because they will not acknowledge the divinity of the State.'

Persecution of true Christianity is as inevitable to-day as it was in the first century. Speaking of Communism and Christianity, Lenin is reported to have said: 'For either to win, the other must be completely destroyed.' And of such religions as Communism and Fascism Barth has said: 'The only possible relation these "religions" can have with Christianity as such is that which was shown by the worship of Cæsar at the downfall of the ancient world, namely, persecution of Christians.'

It is true that *we* are not being persecuted, but we do not know how soon persecution may come to us as it has already come to so many of our fellow-Christians. And how little we are doing to help them! Few things are to me more saddening than the impotence of the Church as a whole to aid persecuted Christians in any land. Were the Church alive and united she could compel any dictator to keep his hands off the Christians. We should take our impotence most seriously to heart.

How are we to meet the situation that confronts us? We can meet it triumphantly only if we possess the things with which John met the hostile world of his day. The Apocalypse reveals to us his noble equipment. It is worthy of note that in the whole book there is no trace of the thought that the cause of Christ might suffer defeat at the hand of its enemies. Indeed, the same thing may be said of the New Testament as a whole. The only fear manifested regarding the Church is that of inward deterioration. Of outward persecution no book of the New Testament betrays any alarm.

The writer of the Apocalypse employs all the powers of his vigorous poetic imagination to set forth and to urge upon his readers six great convictions.

1. He possesses, to begin with, a *Vivid Sense of God*. This is the basis of all his teaching. In all but seven of the twenty-two chapters of the book mention is made of God's throne. It is surprising that not even once does John speak of God as the Father of men. In ch. 4—at the very opening of the Apocalypse proper—he sets forth his great vision of God upon His throne, the object of heaven's adoration and praise. The picture of the Throne, the Rainbow, and the Glassy Sea would steady the nerves of the first readers of the book; and it would be a means of grace to us to ponder over the vision now and then. To preach on this chapter would serve as a test for us preachers. Do we know God well enough to preach about Him? 'What a parish wants,' said Carlyle, 'is a man who knows God otherwise than by hearsay.' The world's greatest need at the present moment is a deeper sense of God. And Canon Guy Rogers is of the opinion 'that the Church as an institution is almost as much in need of God as the world itself.'

2. The second article of the Seer's equipment is an *Unwavering Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ*. The Living Christ permeates and dominates the book from first to last. Here is rich and abundant material for sermons on the Person and the Work of our Lord. Brief mention may be made of three great passages whose use could not fail to deepen and enrich our presentation of Jesus Christ.

(*a*) One is the wonderful passage in the first chapter (vv.$^{9-20}$) in which John receives his commission to write. Here our Lord is portrayed as the glorious Head of the Church. He is in the midst of the churches. Are the members of our churches vitally conscious of His presence? The seven stars are in His right hand: the ideals of the churches are in His keeping. This passage will bring us face to face with such great themes as the Death and the Resurrection-Life of our Lord: 'I was dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore.'

(*b*) The second passage is the vision of ch. 5 in which Christ is set forth as the revealer of the Mind of God. The writing in the book close-sealed with seven seals surely represents the thoughts of God. Who but God Himself could have written that book? The Lamb has 'overcome' to break its seals. In the Apocalypse 'to overcome' means to suffer a martyr's death. By His obedience unto death Christ has learned the mind of God, and He alone can fully reveal to men the thoughts and purposes of God.

(*c*) The last of the three passages is ch. 19$^{11-16}$, where Christ appears as the great Warrior against sin and oppression. He goes forth to destroy the evil might of Rome. Here is matter for many sermons. How suggestive are the Warrior's four names. One of the four is hidden from the Seer, which means that even this poet of noble imagination makes confession of the fact that he is unable to think of a name that would fully and adequately express the prowess and glory of his Lord. John does not dilute his Christology in the hope of making it less obnoxious to his oppressors. He would make short work of our modern Arianism. We cannot meet the present world situation with a diluted Christology.

3. In the third place John had a *Keen Realization of the Evil of Sin*. Here, too, he speaks to our generation. The sin of the Empire does not make him blind or indifferent to the sins of the churches. Let me mention just two passages of which the preacher might well make use at the present time.

(*a*) The first is the famous vision of the Four Horses of various colours (6$^{1-8}$). The passage is peculiarly relevant to the present state of the world. It might have been written for our day. The red, black, and livid horses represent respectively war, famine, and pestilence and death, things which follow each other in causal sequence. The crux of the passage is the interpretation of the white horse. It clearly represents something that

See page 462

leads to war as inevitably as war brings on famine, and famine in turn brings on pestilence and death. What is it but the war-like spirit, the selfish, greedy, pugnacious spirit that is always endeavouring to gain an advantage at the expense of someone else? That spirit was responsible for the last war, and it is in the ascendant to-day; unless it is curbed it will bring in its train all the ghastly things symbolized by the remaining horses of John's vision.

(*b*) The other portion of the Apocalypse to which I would at this point desire to direct the preacher's attention is the Vision of the Seven Trumpets in chs. 8, 9, and 11. The trumpets are, of course, a series of Divine judgments; but would it take us beyond John's own thought to see in them a graphic pictorial representation of the natural consequences of sin? Perhaps not. In any case, inasmuch as these consequences *are* the judgment of God, I do not think a modern preacher could be taken to task if he chose to interpret the trumpets in this way. And what wealth of homiletical material is thus suggested on the devastation wrought by sin. Let us glance at the first four of the trumpets—the four which Archdeacon Charles for no adequate reason would omit from the text. In the first of the four the trees and the green grass are burnt up. Sin destroys the amenities of life, its pleasant and beautiful things. In the second, the creatures which are in the sea are destroyed, as well as the ships which sail the sea. Fish was a staple and important article of diet in the ancient world, particularly so in a seaport like Ephesus. May we not think that John has in mind the thought that sin destroys the food of the people and injures commerce between land and land? In the third, the waters become wormwood and men die when they drink the bitter poison. The springs from which men should draw refreshment, such as music, art, and literature, are poisoned by sin and become the means of death. In the fourth, the sun, the moon, and the stars are darkened. Sin obscures the sources of moral and spiritual illumination. Am I reading too much into the trumpets? In any case, we of this day may well ask ourselves how we compare with this austere teacher. But austere as he is, almost before he takes up his pen to write, he breaks into the noble doxology: 'Unto him that loveth us, and loosed us from our sins by his blood . . . to him be the glory and the dominion for ever and ever.'

4. The fourth of John's great convictions is that *Martyrdom must not be Shirked*. No feature of the book is more striking than his firm insistence that his readers are not to shrink from martyrdom. It so pervades the chapters that illustration is not called for. But here is an instance of the stern teaching: the true text in 13^{10}, as Charles rightly insists, is that found in Codex Alexandrinus which runs thus:

> If any man is for captivity,
> Into captivity he goeth:
> If any man is to be slain with the sword,
> With the sword must he be slain.

John permits no compromise. Compromise would have robbed the Christian faith of one of its essential elements, namely, its absoluteness. Apparently it was John's belief that all the faithful would be martyred. An apostate would reveal by his very apostasy that he was not of the number of the faithful. It is idle to speculate what the outcome would have been if all the Christians had been martyred. John, of course, expected that the martyrs would soon be living the glorious life of the New Jerusalem. But the Holy City did not come as he had anticipated. Christianity was perpetuated through those who survived. It would not, however, have been true Christianity had not those who escaped martyrdom possessed the martyr-spirit. It does not require the actual crisis of martyrdom to ensure the presence and the operation of the martyr-spirit. How would we of this generation fare if confronted with John's grim requirement? 'The fundamental weakness of the Church now,' according to Canon Barry, 'is its lack of moral courage and realism.' John's demand for martyrdom provides the opportunity to preach on the true spirit of the Christian faith. The charge of vindictiveness is frequently brought against the author of the Apocalypse; but let us not forget that he discountenances all resistance on the part of the persecuted Christians. His position does not seem to me to differ from that of Paul when he says to the Romans: 'Never revenge yourselves, beloved, but let the wrath of God have its way.'

All this brings into one's mind the difficult problem of pacifism, on which every preacher would be thankful to be able to say the right and helpful thing. Should we be justified in using John's insistence on a pacific and submissive attitude on the part of his readers as an argument for pacifism in our own day? It does not pertain to my present purpose to attempt to answer this question. I am concerned only to show that John's teaching on martyrdom opens up for the preacher some of the most vital questions of our time.

5. In the fifth place the Seer exhibits a *Firm*

Belief in the Final Destruction of Evil. Here again he speaks to our day. It is easy to lose hope and courage when evil forces are rampant and menacing in the earth. But however dark the prospect appears to us in our most despairing moods, it might well have seemed darker to John. The whole world was dominated by one, mighty, totalitarian power. Could such a power ever be dislodged? Its doom was sealed for John by the fact that it was the enemy of Christ. He makes no allowance for the magnificent service Rome had rendered to humanity. The strange vision of the Woman, the Child, and the Dragon in ch. 12 teaches that the very impetuosity of the persecution of the Church was a sign that the Devil was well aware that he was already vanquished. The rage of Rome, his instrument, was but the final flicker of a beaten foe.

In chs. 17–20, in a most impressive and orderly manner, all the enemies of Christ—all the various repositories of evil—meet one by one their just and inevitable doom. I can see no glimmer of justification for Charles's drastic attempt to improve upon the traditional order of the text in the closing chapters of the book. Nowhere is John more orderly than when he describes the fate of the enemies of Christ. First the City of Rome is destroyed (chs. 17, 18); then the Empire, and the Priesthood of the Cæsar Cult (in ch. 19); then the evil nations beyond the bounds of the Empire—Gog and Magog (20^{7-9}); then the Devil himself (20^{10}); finally, the wicked dead are separated from the righteous dead in the great Judgment, and, together with Death and Hades (who have no further function to perform), are cast into the Lake of Fire (20^{11-15}). What could be more orderly and methodical than this? By means of the imagery and symbolism of these passages the poet is giving expression to his invincible faith that all evil, wherever ensconced and however firmly established, is bound to be annihilated. It is beside the mark to speak of his vindictiveness. It is a poets' way of declaring his conviction that sin and evil will be obliterated. In this respect he rightly takes his place in the true apocalyptic succession. Have we a faith like his? Are we equipped to face the modern world without such a faith? And are we worthy to preach to our day unless we possess such a faith?

6. Finally, this early Christian teacher had a *Clear Vision of a Redeemed Humanity.* Who can tell what his glorious description of the New Jerusalem meant for his harassed readers amid the distresses of their immediate situation? A great and clear vision is one of the supreme needs of our modern day, to counteract the depression of spirit so easily generated by the sight of evil proudly asserting itself. Has prophet or poet ever lived who foresaw as clearly as did our Seer the time when human life would be freed from all its ills? This at least we may say, that no one has pictured the perfect life in more gorgeous poetry. His Apocalypse contains two superb descriptions of the bliss of the redeemed. In spite of much borrowing from earlier poets these pictures are his very own. The first of the two (7^{9-17}) comes relatively early in the book, but beyond all doubt it is a vision of the final bliss. It is one of the noblest passages in all literature. The second is the great vision of the Holy City in 21^{1}–22^{5}. This also is a description of the ultimate bliss of the redeemed.

The use of these two poems is by no means to be limited to the occasions when the preacher is dealing with the life beyond the grave. A true vision of the perfect life has a value that is altogether independent of the seer's conception of the time and place of its realization. John's great pictures can be used as ideals for life on this planet. It would do any preacher inestimable good to steep himself in John's vision of the Holy City. To do so would exert a subtle influence on all his preaching.

Moreover, the details of the great picture of the New Jerusalem will suggest subjects for sermons even to the least imaginative amongst us. Look at 21^{3}. In these days of narrow and perverted nationalism anything that tends to widen one's horizon is of value. 'And I heard,' writes John, 'a great voice out of the throne saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he shall dwell with them, and they shall be his peoples.' Note the plural. The writer has Zec 8^{8} in his mind where we read 'and they shall be my people.' John deliberately changes *people* into *peoples*! In his picture of the perfect life he beholds the various nations of the world, each occupying its own place and making its own contribution. The world would be well on its way to its salvation were it baptized into the universalism of this early teacher.

And let us ever remind ourselves that the City of his vision comes down from God. All our toiling and moiling will not build it. And so we come back to the first article of John's creed, which is the opening clause of every true and living declaration of faith: 'I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth.'

The Psychology of the Oxford Group Movement.

By the Reverend T. Hywel Hughes, M.A., D.Litt., D.D., Swansea.

The Oxford Group Movement is from some points of view the most interesting and perhaps the most hopeful development in the field of religion in recent days. It is as yet in its infancy, and although it is to all appearances a very vigorous and lively infant, it has yet to prove its ability and its right to survive. The test of its survival value must lie in its power of adaptation to the changing needs of the modern religious situation and its ability to make some lasting contribution to the satisfaction of those needs. If it is to do this, the leaders will have to face up more fully to the problems involved and seek to lay some rational basis for the principles on which they proceed. No movement, however sincere and enthusiastic its advocates, can long survive unless it succeeds in finding a rational ground for its assumptions and is able to 'give a reason for the faith that is in it.' While the movement is in its infancy and making its experiments in living and working, it is perhaps too much to expect that it should have a complete philosophy of life and a well-knit core of established truth. But the next stage in its development must be that of seeking for such a philosophy and discovering the truths that will serve as the basis of continuing and expanding life. Without this the movement cannot last, and it must inevitably pass into the gradual enfeeblement and final obscurity that come to all such movements when they ignore or neglect the reason of things.

The movement presents many interesting problems, and it is probably true that no modern movement has stirred so much interested discussion or raised so many questions. This in itself is a good feature, especially if it has the effect of establishing the movement on a sure foundation and ridding it of some of the crudities of its thought and methods. Among the many problems, such as those of lineage and parentage, of its theological affinities and its practical results, probably the most important are the psychological problems which it raises, and it is with those that this article is concerned.

It has to be admitted at once that the movement has given a severe blow to some of the tendencies of modern psychology in its bearing on religion. The experiences of men in the Groups have gone a long way towards showing the futility of seeking to make psychology an exact science, or a purely natural science, as the Experimentalists, and more especially the Behaviourists, are striving to do. The most amazing and unexpected things happen in the realm of spiritual life which baffle men in the attempt to reduce all the phenomena of mind and spirit to definitely quantitative facts. The one thing that seems impossible here is to be able to predict what will happen or what any particular person will do. The movement illustrates the unexpected and incalculable element in psychic and spiritual phenomena, and in so far as this is so it makes it impossible for psychologists to reduce all the facts of mind and spirit to exact and measurable terms, and no less difficult is it to regard them as explicable on the basis of physiological processes, as 'tropisms' or 'conditioned reflexes.' Just as far as this is true is Behaviourism discredited, and the determinism which it asserts and on which it is based becomes untenable. Moreover, the psychic determinism of the psychoanalytic school becomes equally discredited.

Another of the basal assumptions of the modern psychologists represented by the schools mentioned above is seriously impugned. It is assumed by writers of these schools that there is in the psychic life of every man an inherent and natural tendency to find equilibrium when it is disturbed and to recover harmony when its unity and peace are broken. Such a tendency does undoubtedly exist, for it is part of the larger fact that there is in the universe a tendency towards harmony, health, and beauty. In the deeper aspects of its forces the universe is health-promoting and harmony-producing. This is so on the purely natural side, and it is also true on the moral and spiritual side. But this principle is made the basis of a further inference to the effect that there is no need of any force outside man himself—and certainly nothing in the nature of a supernatural power—to bring him into harmony with the moral and rational forces of the universe, and so to come into possession of peace. This is the assumption underlying all the teaching of the psychoanalytic school, more especially in its treatment of sublimation. Freud definitely states that 'the extensive realm of the supernatural is to be eliminated by the advance of scientific procedure.' The same assumption is made by the Behaviourists on the physical side, and with them it issues in the belief that character is formed and destiny determined by the more immediate environmental factors, without having to posit any influence from the past by heredity or by the transmission of dispositions and characteristics from parents to children. To these thinkers all the forces necessary for the amendment of life and for the attainment of perfection of character are to be found in man himself. There is no need of the Holy Spirit or the grace of God to help man. This belief is at the root of much of the modern educational theory, and it has found utterance within the Church itself in a campaign for salvation by education. On the other hand, this faith is the inspiration of the cult of self-expression which finds its crown in the humanism of modern days.

Now the experience of men in the Group Movement goes a long way to prove that this view is one that cannot be maintained. It is an unvarying fact in the movement, exemplified in every case, that the forces for reformation of character and redemption of life are not found in man but in God. Power comes, not from within, but from a source outside and above man. The Groupers make use of the terminology of modern psychology, and we find them speaking of 'sublimation,' of 'suggestion,' and 'transference.' But, unlike the psychologists, they do not regard sublimation, for example, as possible through the forces inherent in the psyche. Thus Mr. Russell in *For Sinners Only* (p. 34 f.) discusses the problems of Sex and Money and the various solutions that are possible for these problems, and he suggests: that the real solution is not to be found in suppression but in sublimation. 'The sex problem ceased to be a problem when it was surrendered to God. The very desire for sin disappeared with the will to obey God.' Not only so, he claims that surrender to God yields complete satisfaction to the instinct of sex, so that women who are childless get complete satisfaction and are happy (p. 50). Moreover, 'impurity slid off when Christ came.' It is not then by a force inherent in the psyche, nor yet by a process of 'drainage,' as some psychologists assert, that these things happen, but by a new-found power that comes through surrender to Christ. There is no doubt that this view is in line with the deepest aspects of Christian experience. The facts exemplified in the Groups thus emphasize the truth that psychology does not go sufficiently far back in its analysis of the experience, and that it omits some essential elements in the experience. Religious men have known this for long, but it is now made clear and finds expression in life and conduct.

There are certain psychological factors in the movement of special interest, and we have now to consider these, mainly as seen in conversion.

It is difficult to discover what the scheme of conversion is in the movement, for when the subject is mentioned at the meetings of the Groups, it is evident that the speakers have not thought out the implications or faced up to the meaning of the change. They speak of it in a casual and popular way, and there is no proper appreciation of the principles involved, nor is there a clear understanding of the mode of operation in the experience of conversion. We may gather a little more from the book which seems to be a textbook of the movement—*For Sinners Only*—but even there the conception is not clear, nor is the idea of it consistently maintained. It would seem, however, from what we can discover that the process of conversion and the experience through which the converts of the movement pass do not conform to any one of the recognized types of conversion. William James speaks of two main types, the Voluntary and the Surrender types, the former being gradual and the latter sudden. Professor Thouless treats of two types also, the Voluntary and the Mystical, the latter being a case of reconversion. But the conversion experience of the Groupers does not fall in with any of these. Conversion is not the gradual dawning of light or the slowly formed decision to surrender to Christ, as it is with many young people who have been nurtured in Christian homes. Nor is it the catastrophic conversion that is exemplified in so many of the great conversions. It would seem that it belongs more to the type of enlightenment than to that of the sudden break with sin. There is evidently a break with sin, but it seems to come gradually and without any deep experience. In other words, it seems to be a blend of the two types hitherto recognized. Viewing the subject as a whole we should not condemn it finally because it does not conform to the usual types. Probably our classification has been too narrow and we have set too rigid a limit to the operations of the Spirit of God. These conversions may at any rate be taken as exemplifying the saying of Jesus that 'the wind bloweth where it listeth,' and as such they may rebuke our stereotyped and formal conceptions. As Christian thinkers we have often tried to force Christian experience into a few definite and clear-cut moulds, and God is always rebuking us by breaking the moulds, or if not this, by pouring experience and life over them. No limit can be set to the activity of God's Spirit. Channels and methods are useful as long as they do not fetter or obstruct. Life, however, forces itself through all forms and takes on ever new forms. The universe is a growing one, a point made prominent in modern philosophy, and this is nowhere more true than in the universe of spiritual experience. The world of spiritual forces breaks through in countless ways and expresses itself in ever new forms. Why quarrel with these conversions if they are not according to our little systems? God fulfils Himself in many ways. The real test is not whether conversion is according to any one or to all the forms, but whether it is fruitful in life, and this test these conversions can stand.

Looking at the matter more closely we note that one striking difference between the conversions of the Group and the ordinary types is to be found in the elements that precede them. There appears to be no deep consciousness of sin, and we find Mr. Russell speaking of confession being made before the meaning of sin has been realized. Here we touch on one of the weaknesses of the Group theology. The treatment of sin is too superficial and even flippant. It may be said that it has a realism that appeals to men, and that the confessions made in public have a profound effect on those who hear them, more especially in the cases of those who are in a highly suggestible state. But there seems little or no trace of what is ordinarily understood by repentance and the conviction of sin. It is all too easy, and in spite of the real effect which it seems to produce, it cannot be regarded as a satisfactory view of the experience. We find the Groupers speaking of the process as a 'unification of the self' (*op. cit.*, 58), or as the 'achievement of a unified will.' But there does not seem to be any real understanding of the disharmony that finds solution nor of the process by which harmony is reached. De Sanctis (see *Religious Conversion*) speaks of the process in one aspect as a reversion to an infantile level in which the beliefs of childhood are accepted without logical ground and the infantile attitude takes precedence over reason and the more mature judgment. The Group experience seems to approximate to this type. Analysing the situation more fully we note that there seems to be a total absence of the sense of fear in the stages preceding conversion. All those psychologists who have given serious thought to conversion have assigned a prominent place to fear in the experience of the converts prior to the conversion experience itself. Starbuck, for example, on the basis of the answers he receives to his questionaires, puts fear first in the list of motives that may induce conversion. William James also emphasizes fear though not as strongly as Starbuck. De Sanctis and Thouless also dwell on the importance of fear in the consciousness of the converts, and the records of revival conversions bear out this emphasis on fear. The fear may differ in content and may centre on different factors. It may be fear of future punishment, or in extreme cases it may develop into fear of having committed the unpardonable sin. Dr. James Drever has pointed out another aspect in the fear of loss or injury to one's personality and of missing the real meaning and goal of life. Such an element does undoubtedly enter into the experience in many cases, and it is on a higher ethical and spiritual level than the former kind of fear. There can be little doubt that in the great majority of cases the most prominent element in the state of disharmony that precedes conversion is fear in some form or other. But such an element seems to be absent from the experience of the Groupers. This fact raises a most interesting question, whether this is not the type of conversion experience that we should grow to expect through the development of what may be called Christian heredity and the influence of successive generations of Christian life and teaching.

If we are entitled to believe that there is slowly being developed a Christian heredity, and we surely are, then we should expect that in the case of children nurtured in Christian homes, where the love of God is an ever-present factor in the atmosphere of the home, and the thought of God as the gracious Father takes strong hold of the children's minds, there would grow a natural reverence for God which would issue in a glad surrender to Him without any element of fear. It would be the response of love, a surrender to the winsomeness of Christ, or to the call of the hero and the leader. In the course of the ages through the influence of Christian heredity this has undoubtedly been so. More and more the children of Christian parents have grown to surrender themselves thus to Christ, and this decisive act is as true a conversion as the catastrophic type. In spite of many efforts on the part of Christian leaders, and more especially of revival and mission leaders and preachers, to force every case of conversion into a recognized mould, and to insist that every person should be converted in the same way, there has slowly been developing a gradual type that is without the excessive element of fear, although even in this it may be present in the form of the fear of the contamination of sin. Dr. William McDougall has pointed out that there is a deep sense of sin associated with adolescence, but he is probably mistaken in speaking of it as sin. Pratt insists that it is nothing more than a consciousness of strong temptation from the urge of sex, blended with the fear that it may end in impurity, and this view is undoubtedly nearer the truth. Fear in this case would belong to the higher type mentioned by Dr. Drever, rather than the fear of punishment or of hell. But in many cases even this kind of fear does not seem to be present in the state that precedes surrender to Christ. It is rather the natural opening of the soul which, to use a phrase of Tertullian, is naturally Christian, to the wonder and beauty of Christ. If, then, there is any meaning in Christian heredity and any power in the influence of Christian education and example, this is the kind of conversion that we should expect to find as the prevailing type of the future. It would have little or no element of fear since the conception of God as the gracious Father, rather than as the just Judge or the avenging Deity, would exclude fear on the one hand, and because on the other hand, since there would not be any deep consciousness of sin, there would be little fear of punishment. Now the interesting fact in connexion with the conversions of the Group is that although there has been, by their own confession, deep and often heinous sin, and although the thought of God has an element of justice in it, there is yet no token of fear. We have, for instance, the story of the three 'who painted things red' as given in *For Sinners Only*, and several other cases are given in this book. These could be supplemented by many other cases given in the Group meetings. It is not fear of punishment here or hereafter that has driven these men to Christ. It may possibly be described as a fear of injury to the self, but even this is subordinate. It is rather a recognition of the claims and the winsomeness of Christ, a surrender to a call or a response to an invitation, a yielding to the leader and comrade. In other words, although these cases are those of men who, unlike the ordinary Christian adolescents, have committed grave sin and stained their consciences with evil, yet the process of conversion seems to approximate to the type found among the adolescents of Christian homes. The break with sin follows, but it is not the sin element that seems prominent nor the conviction of its evil. Are we not warranted in thinking that we are beginning to see the results of Christian heredity and training and that this type is becoming established? If this is so, we should not deplore the fact that these conversions do not conform to any recognized type, but rather we should rejoice that Christian teaching and training and example are producing through the travail of the ages a type that is more in harmony with the Christian conception of God and of His operation in the world and in the soul of man. It is probably true that this was the type represented by the first disciples of Jesus, for they responded to a call and left all to follow Him, without apparently any deep and transforming experience of the soul. It may possibly be that there is a difference in this matter between the Evangelical and the Catholic tradition, but the distinction between these cannot be made merely at this point for this type is in the Group extremely evangelical. One hesitates to speak of this as a new type, or as a new phenomenon, in the field of conversion, but it certainly has elements that are new, although they are elements that we should have been led to expect if we had understood the fact of Christian heredity, and had had faith in the efficacy of Christian teaching and example throughout the ages. It should be noted also that in many cases of conversion in the Groups what we find is a reconversion. Ministers and laymen who have been leaders in Christian life and work confess that they have found a new orientation and a fresh harmony and integration of life in the movement, and in these cases also there has apparently been no element of fear.

There are many other interesting psychological problems connected with the movement which we cannot consider in the space of a short article. The apparent recovery of the lost radiance of religion as witnessed by the shining faces and the joyous, carefree life of the Groupers may be regarded as a striking case of 'transference' and the surrender of responsibility to another, and as such it presents many interesting psychological points. The practice of 'sharing' everything, even the confession of sin, is also an instance of transference and of the relief that comes in unburdening the soul. Here there may be and probably are unconscious elements not wholly unconnected with sex. It presents its own difficulties and has most interesting psychological implications. 'Guidance' again has considerable elements of auto-suggestion and may, probably it does, mean a regression to a more infantile attitude and to a conception of God that leads to an occasional and spasmodic view of His activity in the world. All these have to be passed over for the present.

What are the elements of psychological appeal in the movement? That it has a strong appeal is clear from the numbers that gather at the meetings and the growing audiences that attend when anything in the nature of a mission is undertaken by members of the Groups, as well as by the type of young men and women who give themselves to the work, going forth without script or purse and trusting their all to the work of the 'Kingdom of God.' If we analyse the movement from this point of view we discover that there are many factors in the appeal. Probably the most prominent is the factor already mentioned that these young people go forth and risk all for Christ and His Kingdom. Such abandonment, such an experiment of faith whenever and wherever practised has its appeal to the heroic in man. It may have been one element in the appeal of Jesus, that He called men to go forth not knowing where they went and that He had no place to lay His head. It certainly was so in the case of the Mendicant Friars and the Waldensians. Garibaldi's appeal for volunteers and the response made to it belongs to the same order of facts. The faith that goes forth not knowing where it goes, that takes its fate in its hands, scorning laborious days and courting dangers for the Kingdom's sake, always commands respect and inspires response. It is so in the case of the Groupers. Another element in the appeal is to be found in the strange methods and what may be called the 'unusual and unexpected technique' of the movement. There are no stereotyped orders of service, no hymns, and a free and easy style with direct terms and even slangy phrases. There is an absence of theological terminology and even of religious expressions, so that religion is brought out of the usual channels and ruts and becomes more like the everyday matter and the layman's business which it was meant to be. Here also something is probably due to an element of antagonism, or if not of antagonism, of indifference to, and lack of reverence for, the ordinary methods of the churches. Side by side with these facts we must place another, that of the type of young men and women who form the Groups. They belong mainly to the better classes, most of them are young university men, swaggering and unconventional in dress and spirit, good-looking and with a considerable element of physical charm and even of sex appeal. *For Sinners Only* makes this element very prominent, and it certainly cannot be ruled out as a factor that constitutes the appeal of the movement. Lastly, there is an element that makes a strong appeal to many, although it may become, and really is even now, one of the sources of weakness in the best religious life of the movement. It is that all the emphasis seems to be thrown on faith at the expense of knowledge, and there is a tendency to stress the antagonism between the two. It is again a matter of 'heart' against 'head,' of instinct and intuition against reason. In an age of excessive intellectualism with its over-elaboration of science and an over-development of the scientific spirit, such a reversion seems to follow inevitably, as may be seen in the frequent revival of mystical religion in the ages of intellectualism. It is a protest of the whole man against too strong an emphasis on one aspect of his personality, and as such it has its appeal. But it has its dangers also and the Group movement must guard against this. A faith that ignores knowledge and a life that is indifferent to reason cannot long survive. The leaders must therefore push their way back to a nobler and more satisfying conception of God, and place their faith in a grander and more commanding Christ than hitherto they have reached. To do this they must face up to the reason of things and think their way to the living and changeless elements of a real religious life. When they have done this there will be no limit to the possibilities and the power of the movement.

Literature.

THE CHRISTIAN AND WAR.

We bring to the notice of our readers four publications on this very vital topic. That it is a vital subject no one, we imagine, will deny. Nor will any deny that recent world-events have made it perhaps more perplexing than it was. Who is happy about Abyssinia, or Manchuria, or China; and who can say what was our national duty about any of them? The four writers we are briefly to consider are as uncertain on such a practical problem as any of us. They all take the perfectly reasonable position 'it is not for us to give ready answers to highly complicated world-problems, our point just is that War is utterly unchristian.' All four are men of acknowledged weight in discussion, all are scholarly, all are eminently sane. Further, none of them speaks in that irritating accent of self-conscious superiority which marks some Pacifists and confirms the non-Pacifist in his views. For some Pacifists are about the most militant people we know. No, all these have a case to state, and they state it with courtesy and calmness, recognizing that as yet conscientious men are on the other side too.

First, we have Professor G. H. C. Macgregor's *The New Testament Basis of Pacifism* (James Clarke; 3s. 6d. net), which has been before the public for some time. With clear judgment Dr. Macgregor expounds the New Testament passages which bear on the subject, and a very valuable item in his book is the appendix which prints fully all the relevant passages. He has little difficulty in disposing of the verses which anti-Pacifists quote, and his interpretation is enormously strengthened by the circumstance that no ancient Father, or indeed any exegete of consequence, ever found in them a justification for war. In Dr. Macgregor's view this really settles the question; if the New Testament contains nothing that can be even distorted into a defence of war, but much pointing the other way, the duty of the Christian is surely plain. At whatever cost, the individual Christian should renounce war. Dr. Macgregor is not a Tolstoian in rejecting all restraint by force. His point is that while 'police' force may injure the wicked for the common good, war is blind destruction wrought upon the personally innocent. In his view the whole subject must be treated upon the basis of three postulates: (1) the first principle of Jesus' ethic is love towards one's neighbour; (2) this ethic in turn is based upon belief in a Father God who sets infinite value on every individual human soul; (3) all the teaching of Christ must be interpreted in the light of His own way of life, above all of His Cross.

His conclusion is that the Church should take her stand quite definitely and unambiguously on the Pacifist side. The sub-Christian components of the State may be doing their duty, as they see it, in resisting invasion—as the less of two evils—but the Christian will take no part in fighting; and he holds that the practical results of war, as it has come to be, would exceed in damage and loss any that might follow from non-resistance.

Second, in *Christian Attitudes to War and Peace* (Oliver and Boyd; 6s. net), Professor T. S. K. Scott-Craig, M.A., B.D., gives a very interesting and informative account of the discussion as it has historically been carried on, leading to an explanation of his own practical suggestions. It is an impartial, well-balanced book. He knows the strength of the Pacifists' arguments. He knows and acknowledges the strength of the position of those who while hating war cannot go all the way with the Pacifists. His own conclusion is 'we cannot hope for a united Christian front to the problem of war; but we can work for a closer co-operation among Christian groups which have so many fundamental principles in common. Perhaps it is even more important that we should co-operate more effectively with those outside the Visible Church, who share that liberal philosophy from which the Church itself has learned to profit. However black the international situation may be, and however disunited the Church may show itself, the liberal Christian is not wholly despondent. He believes that his principles are in accordance with ultimate Reality and that, if not now then in the coming generations and as the fruit of much patient labour, those principles will be realized in the conduct of disputes between the nations. And as an immediate task he will work for a truly international court and an effective police-army.'

We have quoted this conclusion at length not only because it is so well expressed but because it is so far in agreement with that of all the writers we are considering.

For third, Canon Raven in *War and the Christian* (S.C.M.; 5s. net) insists in his own forceful way that such 'patient labour' to arrive at a common understanding among Pacifists and Peace-lovers who are not Pacifists must begin at once. He himself is as strong a Pacifist as Professor Macgregor, and much more irritating, for he sets out, as he tells us repeatedly, to be deliberately provocative. In the earlier part of his book he makes great and effective play, demolishing the more familiar and anti-Pacifist arguments. But what makes his book most valuable is the concluding section, in which he implores Pacifists and non-Pacifist Christians to stop shouting at each other and get down to an approach to mutual understanding. His call is not to the Church but to the individual. The Churches, he very truly observes, cannot speak with a united voice because they are not of united mind. And if a Church did make a pronouncement prematurely either for or against Pacifism schism would result; the breaking-point in some cases is dangerously near. Therefore let there be discussion, plenty of it, in all sorts of groups or circles, and Canon Raven is confident that all real Christians will discover that they are much nearer agreement than they thought they were. He holds, as Dr.

Macgregor does, that an ethical question leads back to a theological one, and so he believes that grappling with the problem of the Christian attitude to war might lead to re-examination or restatement of the basal affirmations of our Faith.

Lastly, we have quite a small but pungent pamphlet, *Pacifism and Christian Common Sense* (Mowbray; 1s. net), by Archdeacon Percy Hartill, B.D. In small compass it contrives to discuss—and discuss with great ability—a number of big questions including the moral use of force, war and moral evil, defensive war, war for international security and the alternative. Within the compass of forty-seven pages it is obvious none of these topics can be handled fully, yet each is treated suggestively. The author is a thorough-going Pacifist but realizes with our other writers the real practical perplexities. In answer to the question, If the nation is involved in war what is the duty of the Christian? he sees clearly the enormous complications involved. We shall all be involved directly or indirectly. Any factory hand will be assisting the armed forces. What then? Conscience must decide for each, but broadly it may be held, the writer thinks, that while the Christian will refuse to fight, he will not necessarily refuse to go on with his work, even if it be making munitions.

KERR LECTURES.

The Rev. Edgar P. Dickie, M.C., B.A., M.A., B.D., Professor of Divinity, the University of St. Andrews, is to be congratulated not only on the prompt issue of his Kerr Lectures for 1937 (delivered at Trinity College, Glasgow, towards the close of the year) but also on the Lectures themselves, which are a timely contribution to Christian Apologetics. They deal vitally with that vital topic of present-day theology, the nature of revelation; and their standpoint is adumbrated in the title, *Revelation and Response* (T. & T. Clark; 10s. net).

The Barthians are rightly insisting, says Professor Dickie, that knowledge of God comes not by search but by revelation. But it should be added that, although man is unable to find his way to God, he is able to respond to God. And the relation between revelation and response involves the exercise of human reason. Deny the authenticity of reason's judgment and you make it impossible for man to tell when God speaks to him.

Mr. Dickie examines the idea of revelation in the light of modern tendencies in psychology, ethics, and philosophy. He considers in particular the subjects of Revelation and History, Religious Certainty, and the Finality of the Christian Gospel.

Though Christianity rests on history it cannot be explained in terms of history alone. As for the recent movement of Form-Criticism it has strengthened the testimony, not of the historians, but of the 'histories of souls.' In the discussion of Religious Certainty it is shown how the difficulties inherent in Barth's theory of religious knowledge ('the vertical hypothesis') may be overcome by Karl Heim's theory ('the Bethel hypothesis'). In the concluding discussion the Finality of the Christian Gospel is found neither in morals nor in piety but in the offer of forgiveness, and it is summed up in the confession 'Jesus is Lord.'

It will be gathered that Mr. Dickie ranges over a wide field, and it may be here observed that he has not attempted to work his material into a formal unity. Perhaps with more time at his disposal before publication he could have achieved this. On the other hand, the strength of the book lies not so much in constructive presentation as in criticism. Mr. Dickie has an acute and critical mind, and many will be grateful to him for exercising it so vigorously on so topical a subject. He is well read in the recent literature, both English and German, and one of the most useful portions of his book (if one of the most difficult to follow) is its exposition of Karl Heim's dimensional theology.

The book is rich in illustrative instance drawn from literature and experience, and the author is obviously of opinion that theology and humour need not be dissociated. Its value for the reader would have been enhanced if the expositions had been more clear-cut in places and if the constructive aim had been briefly set forth in an Introduction. Yet we welcome the useful summaries prefixed to each chapter. We bespeak for the volume a wide circulation.

ANCIENT SMYRNA.

From the epistle addressed to the angel of the Church at Smyrna, Biblical readers know this city as a rich, prosperous, and dissolute one, largely inhabited by Jews bitterly opposed to Christianity. It was a place where Christian persecution might be expected, and indeed actually appeared. But the Church seems to have remained faithful to Christ, and though poor and oppressed was spiritually rich. The history of the city is therefore of peculiar interest to Biblical students, but unfortunately it has never been completely and systematically unfolded. There have been monographs by Oikonomos, Lane, Slaars, and others, and brief notices in periodicals, dictionaries, books of travel, commentaries, and similar publications, but it has remained for Dr. C. J. Cadoux, the Mackennal Professor of Church History at Mansfield College, Oxford, to fill the gap, and New Testament scholars the world over will feel grateful to him. In *Ancient Smyrna: A History of the City from the Earliest Times to 324 A.D.* (Blackwell; 25s. net) he gives a welcome study of the whole subject, based on all the available literary and monumental evidence. The learned author has special qualifications for the work, for not only was he born in Smyrna and has studied its history on the spot, but in Oxford he has had access to all the pertinent literature, less accessible elsewhere.

After a survey of the geography of the neighbourhood of Smyrna (or 'Zmyrna,' as the name appears in 64 out of 205 cases in inscriptions), Dr. Cadoux describes the successive phases of the city's history from the invasion of the Hittites about 2000 B.C. down to the time of Constantine. He fails to distinguish between the Hatti (or 'Proto-Hittites') and the invaders who took their name (after settling at Hattushash), but otherwise the description of Hittite rule is wonderfully accurate. The buildings at Smyrna, its civic institutions, its gods and goddesses, and other matters are fully dealt with. Two of the most interesting chapters are those on the Jews and Christians in the city. The author is probably correct in his view that the Church was not founded by Paul, but by others (perhaps from Ephesus) before this apostle visited the city, and that its origin dates from some point within the period A.D. 53–56. He is no doubt right also in accepting the traditional belief that, when Domitianus was killed (A.D. 96), the Apostle John was released from his confinement in Patmos and returned in safety to Ephesus, from which place he was persuaded by the Milesian Christians to visit the Smyrnaian citizens (not the Church) and preach to them. In a valuable footnote, extending to nine columns, Dr. Cadoux discusses the credibility of the *Vita Polycarpi*. He inclines to believe that Pionios was in all probability the author, and accepts its assertions as in the main worthy of trust, without feeling obliged to reject the statements made by Eirenaios. Footnotes are numerous on almost every page of the volume, and will be welcomed by the reader for the valuable information they contain as well as for their references to authorities. There is a complete bibliography, a number of plates, three excellent maps, and a most useful index of fifty-two columns. We venture to say that the volume will become a standard one, a necessary adjunct to every New Testament scholar's library, and a mine of information to all interested in the origin and history of the Early Christian Church.

THE ENIGMA OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

Following upon his earlier work, 'The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist,' Dr. Robert Eisler has written a remarkable book, *The Enigma of the Fourth Gospel* (Methuen; 12s. 6d. net). Briefly stated, his theory is that the Gospel was written about A.D. 115 by John, a son of the high-priest Annas. Using the traditions of Lazarus, the Beloved Disciple, John dictated his Gospel to his secretary Marcion, who maliciously seized the opportunity to introduce his distinctive doctrinal ideas into the work, with the result that the Evangelist was compelled to subject the Gospel to a hurried, but unfortunately incomplete, revision. Like all Dr. Eisler's work, this theory is supported by much erudition, but it is sadly wanting in critical judgment. Among the doubtful expedients by which it is supported may be mentioned: a dubious reading of the Anti-Marcionite Prologue to the Fourth Gospel; a confident but improbable claim that Irenaeus does not mean John the Apostle when he speaks of 'John the disciple of the Lord'; a tentative identification soon treated as a fact, of the John of Ac 4^6 with Theophilus the high-priest; a gratuitous tampering with the text of Ac 12^2; an arbitrary transposition of sections in Ac 11–15; a preference for the Western reading in Gal 2^9; an acceptance of the uncertain Papias-tradition regarding the martyrdom of James and John; a confident assertion that these are the two witnesses of Rev 11^{3-11}; and a claim that the Gospel still contains traces of Marcionism. The discerning reader will not feel that Eisler has solved the enigma of the Fourth Gospel; but he will be less certain that he has solved the enigma of Eisler himself. In sum, we may say that the book is valuable mainly for the information it misapplies and for a series of beautifully executed portraits of Eisler's heroes.

HUGH ROSS MACKINTOSH.

Messrs. T. & T. Clark have published a volume of sermons by the late Professor Mackintosh, with a Memoir by his friend Professor A. B. Macaulay—

Sermons by Hugh Ross Mackintosh, D.Phil., D.Th., D.D. (7s. net). 'Lives' of prominent theologians are at a discount to-day. Publishers are shy of them. They are not bought or read. The only thing that vindicates a full biography is that its subject was intimately connected with some big movement. An almost perfect example is Sir George Adam Smith's biography of Henry Drummond, which contains a classic account of the Moody movement. But there was nothing like this in Dr. Mackintosh's life. It was a placid stream. There were torrential episodes in his time—Modernism, Barthianism, Fundamentalism—but he was identified with none of them. He went his own quiet, efficient way. There was nothing to chronicle except the production of books. Dr. Macaulay's tribute in this volume is therefore adequate in extent. It is also very well done. He knew his friend probably better than any one else outside the family circle, and he helps us to see the man as well as the theologian. There is insight too, and genuine admiration, with the touch of friendly exaggeration which we have a right to expect. The memoir is sufficient, and it could not have been done better.

Dr. Mackintosh occupied a high position in the theological world. This was not because of any original contribution to theological thought. As Dr. Macaulay shrewdly observes: 'Hugh's pre-eminent gifts lay less in the direction of speculative thinking than in that of penetrating criticism and lucid exposition.' Add to that a quite extraordinary gift of expression, and you have the secret of the great work he did for theology. Within the region thus indicated he had unusual intellectual powers, and the merit of all that he accomplished was a clear-sighted and penetrating exposition of the Catholic creed. He was neither heretic nor traditionalist. He pursued the middle way, and that with an insight and grasp which had their roots in a profoundly religious life. He had what Bagehot calls 'an experiencing nature,' and his orthodoxy came not from argument but from a deep, spiritual experience.

This was evident nowhere so clearly as in his preaching. The sermons collected in this volume are typical of his pulpit work. He was keenly interested in the mechanics of sermon-making, as all great preachers are. But this interest was superficial. His real concern was to get over a gospel that would win souls. His preaching was evangelical, Biblical, expository, interesting, and finished. It had neither eloquence nor drama in it except the eloquence of truth and the excitement of 'the greatest drama ever staged.' In the sermons before us one can hear the quiet, serious, cultured voice pressing home some great evangelical message with an appeal that touches something deep in us. He was always heard gladly by cultured and uncultured alike because he was simple and dealt with the simplicities that we all want to hear and believe.

This volume is a worthy memorial of its subject, and will preserve for many the image of one who was above all else a good man. Dr. Mackintosh was not only a devout Christian: he was very human. It is a revelation that he played football, but many have cause to know that he was almost a first-class golfer. And you could not be long in his company without realizing that he had a keen sense of humour. His goodness was therefore not oppressive. But it was very real, and Dr. Macaulay deserves our gratitude for the tender and beautiful offering he has made to his friend's memory.

LITTLE GIDDING.

Nicholas Ferrar of Little Gidding (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net), by Mr. A. L. Maycock, is a biography of 'one of the greatest Christian Englishmen that have ever lived,' 'one of the wisest and best men that have ever adorned the Church of England.' It is a very interesting book, learned yet human, and its value is largely the outcome of Mr. Maycock's study of the collection of Ferrar manuscripts at Magdalene College, Cambridge. After giving an account of Nicholas Ferrar's education at school and college, of his travels in Italy and Spain, and of his connexion with the Virginia Company, the biographer goes on to relate how the manor of Little Gidding was purchased and became the scene of 'a story fragrant with the sweetness of the Christian virtues and radiant with the light of Christian joy.' It was on this story that Shorthouse drew in his famous novel, 'John Inglesant.' The place, the household, and the rule are all carefully described by the biographer. An account is given of Nicholas' wide circle of friends, including such names as those of Richard Crashaw, George Herbert, and Bishop Williams. Certain enterprises upon which the household of Little Gidding engaged themselves are also described; and, finally, Nicholas' later days.

Mr. Maycock concludes: 'As one stands by that plain, nameless tombstone outside the little church in the remote fields of Huntingdonshire, one wonders whether Little Gidding will ever again become more than the occasional resort of a few interested antiquaries. Will the torch ever be relighted in this holy place? Will it ever again belong to a community who will pass to and fro from the church in procession for the daily offices, following "the good old way" of devotion to the service of God and their fellow-men?'

QUAKER HISTORY.

Children of Light (Macmillan; 12s. 6d. net), edited by Howard H. Brinton, is a collection of essays by various writers, students of Quaker history, in honour of Rufus M. Jones, himself a well-known historian of Mysticism and Quakerism. 'Children of Light' was an early name for the Quakers, and these studies illustrate various ways and means by which the 'Inner Light' was followed by its children. The chapters are approximately in chronological order of subjects with similar subjects grouped together. The first five essays deal with the founders of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, the next three with Quaker dealings with the Continent of Europe as carried on in Hebrew, Latin, and Dutch. Quakers during the American revolution are represented by two essays. The next four deal with various aspects of life in the Society of Friends in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and the final essay presents general considerations which have a bearing upon the whole history of Quakerism.

Of the essayists, Herbert G. Wood and Henry Joel Cadbury are perhaps the best known on this side of the Atlantic. But many will turn with interest to Mr. Brinton's study, in the final essay, of 'the principal stages and the main turning-points' in the religious life as these are described in Quaker autobiographical journals, of which approximately one hundred were considered by the essayist. Here are the stages that usually appear: Divine revelations in childhood; compunction over youthful frivolity; period of search and conflict, convincement, conversion; seasons of discouragement; entrance upon the ministry; adoption of plain dress, plain speech, and simple living; curtailment of business; advocacy of social reform. These stages are illustrated one by one. Though the word itself is seldom found in the journals, conversion was the central event in the spiritual progress of the Quaker journalist.

A Self Worth Having, by the Rev. Professor W. G. Chanter, D.D. (Abingdon Press; $1.25), is an excellent bit of work. It is at once psychologically penetrating and soundly Christian. The writer has his eye on modern life, especially as lived in America to-day; he is alive to its perils, and he knows the remedy. To illustrate what is involved in any self really worth having he presents a very fresh study of the personality of Jesus, especially in His re-action to temptation. There are six chapters in the book dealing with such topics as the Fallacy of Drift, the Way to Freedom, the Self and Self-denial. One of the finest is on Faith as the Real Self's Native Air. Written throughout in a vigorous style this is a courageous and stimulating book.

The Augustana Book Concern have had the excellent idea of issuing a volume of Meditations and Prayers in very large type for the use of old people. The title is *At Eventide*, by Bishop Gottfrid Billing, rendered from the ninth Swedish edition by E. W. Olson, and the price is $1.25.

Professor Allan Barr, M.A., of the United Free Church College, Edinburgh, has conferred a great boon on students of the relations subsisting among the Synoptic Gospels by constructing and publishing *A Diagram of Synoptic Relationships* (T. & T. Clark; 4s. net). It is a work of great ingenuity and skill. It presents the student with the Synoptic problem at a glance. By the use of different colours one sees the material common to all three, the material common to Luke and Matthew but not to Mark, and the material peculiar to each. Then by cross lines one can immediately trace differences in order of presentation. Further, the relationships of every individual verse in each Gospel are distinctly shown, if it is represented in either of the other two. That the diagram will be of vast service is evident. It will not render the familiar 'Synopse' of Huck superfluous, but as an adjunct its value is patent. We congratulate Professor Barr very cordially on his achievement, as ingenious as laborious; and in a production of this kind a very special meed of praise is due to the printers. The diagram folds neatly and conveniently into book form and is prefaced by a succinct and illuminating exposition of the present positions in the study of the Synoptics.

The Development of the Supernatural in Human Experience (James Clarke; 6s. net), by the Rev. Wallace Deane, M.A., B.D., seeks to illustrate that aspect of man's religious development which has been described as 'the transference or sublimation of wonder.' Mr. Deane has made a special study of primitive man and has already written on Fijian Society. In this book he deals with such subjects as wonder, imagination, myth and mystery, miracle and law, miracle and 'the new marvellous.' There is a certain discontinuity between his chapters, but he has succeeded in embodying within them a great deal of interesting matter, both old and new. The standpoint consistently maintained throughout the book is theistic and Christian. His final contention is that 'the essence of the wonderful is personality,' and that 'personality . . . has itself a value which is not complete without a personal destiny.'

Expository Studies in St. John's Miracles, by Mr. T. Torrance, F.R.G.S. (James Clarke; 5s. net), is presumably by a layman, though the reprehensible habit of authors who leave out the 'Rev.' before their names sometimes leaves the reviewer at a loss. The book before us is the product of much careful study, and the exposition has much to commend it. It is earnest, evangelical and sometimes suggestive, and doubtless ministers who dig in it may turn up something of value for their own uses. The author deals with ten miracles, from the Cana incident to the second miraculous draught of fishes, and he rightly regards these miracles as 'signs,' expressive of the purpose of Jesus' mission in the world. We must recognize with respect work into which the writer has obviously put a great amount of heart and mind; and many who share his evangelical traditionalism will find light and help in his earnest words.

The fourth centenary of the 'setting-up' of the English Bible in the parish churches is having the happy effect of turning many minds to a fresh study of the sacred book. The National Council formed to arrange for the due commemoration of this notable event has, among other things, asked the Rev. Canon Vernon F. Storr, Sub-Dean of Westminster, to write a suitable handbook on the Bible, and he has now published *The Light of the Bible* (Hodder & Stoughton; 1s. net). It is written in a clear and simple style. Convinced that the present neglect of the Bible is due in large measure to perplexity arising from newer views of inspiration, the writer gives an explanation of what these views imply and of how they make the Bible a new book. He follows this up with an outline of the course of Bible history and of the revelation of the living God given therein. In conclusion, he calls attention to some of the great stories and literary gems of the Bible. It is all very sane and persuasive and should prove a stimulus and a useful guide to many.

Fishers of Men, by the Rev. W. Edwin Bywater (Independent Press; 3s. net), is a series of brief 'studies in the twelve apostles.' The difficulty about such studies is that while the available material is very abundant in some cases, in others it is meagre or practically non-existent. The writer has made the most of his material and produced a very readable book. He does not touch on critical questions or enter into the minutiæ of exegesis. His aim has been 'to show the disciples as they really were, to understand the facts which emerge from a study of their behaviour and to learn the lessons which they teach.' In the pursuit of this aim he has attained a very commendable measure of success.

Messrs. Longmans have made it possible for every one to obtain a copy of Professor William James's *The Varieties of Religious Experience.* They have published the volume clearly printed and well bound at 5s. net.

Among its other activities the National Council formed to commemorate the fourth centenary of the English Bible has had the happy idea of reprinting some notable essays on the Bible as literature. These essays are six in number. They include three by Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch on Reading the Bible, one each by W. Macneile Dixon and A. Clutton-Brock on The English Bible, and one by John Livingston Lowes on The Noblest Monument of English Prose. The Bishop of Durham contributes an introductory essay, and the whole is published under the title of *The English Bible*, edited by Canon Vernon F. Storr (Methuen; 3s. 6d. net). This little book is a real literary feast and ought to have a wide circulation among intelligent youth and especially in the student world.

Messrs. Nisbet & Co. are issuing a series of half-crown books under the general title, 'The New Library of Devotion,' and under the general editorship of the Dean of St. Paul's. It is the aim and hope of the Editor and the Authors 'to give some guidance and encouragement in the spiritual life in harmony with the best religious thought of the day.' We have before us the volume of the series entitled *The Mercy of God*. It comes from the pen of the Right Rev. J. W. Hunkin, O.B.E., M.C., D.D., Bishop of Truro. It is based on the words of

Scripture, chosen over a wide field, including the Prophets, the Psalms, Jewish writings in the Old Testament and the Apocrypha, the Gospels, and the New Testament generally. The quality of mercy in man is discussed at the close, with illustrations from history and modern experience. We cordially commend the book for devotional reading.

Impending Great Events, by Mr. John Ritchie (Pickering & Inglis; 2s. 6d. net), is the title of a series of addresses on the Second Advent and the dread happenings of the last times as the writer understands them. The prophecies of Daniel and the Book of Revelation are interpreted in the most literal way, and only readers of the same way of thinking will be able to agree with the writer. He fixes no date for the Second Advent but believes it to be so near that 'there will not be time for many more books on this subject.' As for the millennium, 'the chronic grumble of the farmer will no longer be heard on the earth, and I suggest that this of itself is sufficient evidence of the millennium!' Mingled with much that is fanciful there is a strain of powerful and solemn appeal.

Union of Christendom (S.P.C.K.; 8s. 6d. net) is designed to supply the general Christian public with means of study of the various Christian denominations so that the peculiar doctrinal position and principles of each may be intelligently grasped. This task, of course, has frequently been attempted before now; but this work is on almost encyclopædic scale. The Right Rev. Kenneth Mackenzie, Bishop of Brechin, has acted as editor. First, we have a discussion on the demand for Union; then excellent accounts of the causes of Disruption; then descriptions of the present grouping of Christendom; then a very interesting group of papers on the possibility of a united Christendom by writers representative of the various churches; finally, an equally interesting group on the essential principles of Catholicism. It may be fairly claimed that each contribution to a notable volume is by one who has every right to speak for his own denomination. There are thirty-one contributors and we cannot even catalogue them. Among them and under their able editor they have given us a book which it may be said marks an epoch in the discussions on Reunion.

The Fellowship of the Prayer, by the Rev. G. Lacey May (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net), contains 'forty readings on the Lord's Prayer.' These readings are very brief, but taken together they are very comprehensive. They deal with the petitions of the Lord's Prayer almost word by word. They are always suggestive and to the point, well fitted to guard against a mechanical repetition of the prayer, and to quicken a sense of the meaning and scope of the several petitions.

No one who is concerned about the life and witness of the Church can help being deeply interested in a book like *Sunday Morning: The New Way. Papers on the Parish Communion*, edited by Brother Edward, Priest-Evangelist (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). It is not about Sabbath-keeping: it is about the time and way of the observance of the Lord's Supper. The 'new way' is to have early celebration at 9 o'clock, to be followed by breakfast. Let no one scoff at the breakfast. It is an essential part of the new way, because it not only typifies but promotes real fellowship and unity. We have fourteen papers here by different hands, all bearing testimony to the quickening effect of this new way on congregations of very different types. There are also valuable appendices with practical guidance and enlightening information. The book is encouraging for two reasons. One is that it shows how much can be done to let the Holy Spirit work by men of vision and faith. The other is the fact that there are so many men of this kind scattered over the country.

The latest additions to Messrs. Stockwell's half-crown sermon series—'The People's Pulpit'—are *The Tide of God*, by the Rev. G. Forbes Morgan; *Things that Matter*, by the Rev. Alwyn Lake Thomas; and *The Light of the World*, by the Rev. Gilbert W. Moore, B.D.

We are always glad to draw attention to the 'Torch Library' and 'Religion and Life Books,' both series being published by the Student Christian Movement Press. The latest volume in the first series is *Paul of Tarsus*, by the Rev. T. R. Glover (3s. 6d. net); and in the second, *The Fate of Man in the Modern World*, by Mr. Nicholas Berdyaev; and *The Cross of Job*, by Principal H. Wheeler Robinson, D.D. (1s. net each).

Christianity in Eclipse: Some Lessons from History.

By the Reverend F. W. Dillistone, M.A., B.D., St. Andrew's Vicarage, Oxford.

What does he mean by Soul? Is the [illegible]

In these days of constant missionary expansion it is not altogether pleasant to think of the great failures of Christian missions. Yet it is a well-known fact that in certain areas where, at one time, there were apparently vigorous Christian churches, there are to-day few traces even of outward relics and remains. A man of faith longs for the time when the Cross shall again be uplifted in these areas; but he is bound to admit that for the present Christianity is in eclipse and the earlier effort seems to have been in vain.

One example of this eclipse forms the subject of Dr. L. E. Browne's notable book, *The Eclipse of Christianity in Asia.* He sets out to examine the causes of the rapid subjugation of much of Eastern Christendom by the power of Islam. Why was it that peoples apparently Christian so quickly embraced the Muhammadan yoke? He suggests various reasons. For one thing, the Bible had never been translated into Arabic. 'If the Christians had been quick to seize the opportunity and had made the first Arabic book the Bible instead of the Qurân, the whole course of the religious history of the East might have been different'(14). Again, the growth of monasticism had tended to turn men's minds to the thought of self-torture and self-improvement rather than to the forgiveness and grace of God; while bitter rivalry between different sections of Christendom made easier the advance of the Arab forces. But the supreme reason for the eclipse of Christianity in this area was, Dr. Browne thinks, the reliance of the Church on outward, worldly success, rather than on the inner marks of the Spirit. 'The people who called themselves Christians had accepted the false idea of the supremacy of worldly might—an idea closely akin to what in our own day we call secularism—in other words, the denial of the supremacy of the spirit. So they were allowed to join themselves to a system in which religion and worldly empire were one, until the time should come when its empire would fail and worldly might would be seen to be no criterion of the divine favour' (184). The Church in Asia failed to extricate itself from the civilization it had helped to create and succumbed before the onrush of the new civilization of Islam.

Looking farther East to China, we find that whereas Nestorian missionaries entered the country in A.D. 635 and met with much apparent success, by the year A.D. 1000, little trace of vital Christianity remained. What were the reasons for this tremendous failure? Wholesale baptisms without sufficient care for spiritual reality must be held partly responsible. But the main reason was that Christianity, as it came to be established in China, at that time, was fundamentally a foreign religion. The missionary-monks were themselves aliens and the Church consisted rather of foreigners resident in China than of the Chinese themselves. There is no record of any Scriptures being translated into the vernacular and only a fragment of a possible Chinese liturgy is extant. How different this was from the Buddhist missionaries who made a real appeal to the intelligentsia of China by developing a high style of Chinese in translating their Sutras. Buddhism entered into the soul of the country—Christianity did not. And it is consequently not altogether surprising to read that, after a considerable period, worship toward the East was regarded as the principal thing in the Chinese Church, that the sign of the Cross was found everywhere—and yet the standard of spirituality among Christians was probably lower than that of the most cultured and noble pagan Chinese of the day. The tragedy was concluded when Catholic missionaries came, to quarrel first with the Nestorians and then with each other, thus introducing a spirit of competition alien to the Chinese spirit and in fact going in the very teeth of what it regards as highest and best. Christian missions in China failed because Christianity remained the religion of the foreigner, unable at that time to enter, by sympathy and sacrifice, into the general life and culture of the Chinese.

But perhaps the most notable example in history of the failure to hold an area apparently won for Christianity is seen in the case of the Church of North Africa. This is an oft-quoted example and deserves careful consideration. What was it that lay behind this expulsion of the Christian forces? Were there wrong methods and policies which can be avoided in the missionary churches to-day?

There is a remarkably interesting account of the eclipse of Christianity in this area in Mr. L. R. Holme's informative book, *The Extinction of the Christian Churches in North Africa.* He shows how Christianity became firmly established in North

Africa in the second century A.D. There was a wide stretch of land on the southern shore of the Mediterranean which had become a flourishing Roman colony; vigorous cities, such as Carthage, were centres of trade and government. In this colony, as so often happens, three distinct strata of society soon appeared. Firstly there was the ruling class—the military, the civil servants, the leading citizens, all of whom were pure Romans. Secondly there were the original inhabitants of the country—the Berbers and the Moors; most of the latter had retreated to the mountains in the south and acted as a constant menace to the more civilized parts of the province. Thirdly there were the mixed peoples—the product of the many marriages between pure Romans and members of the aboriginal population.

Now the interesting thing is that although the Church was firmly established amongst the Romans and the mixed population, it never really captured the hearts of the Berbers and Moors. Both in constitution and organization the Church tended to mould itself on the imperial model and it is not surprising that when schismatic movements appeared they found a ready following among the native Christians. This was true of the Montanist movement and even more of Donatism, whose appeal was mainly to the Moorish elements of the Church; in fact, had the Donatists been allowed to pursue their work unhindered, they might well have won over far more of the native population to at least a form of the Christian faith. As it was, however, the official Church determined to crush the schismatics, with the result that the native races were still further alienated from Christianity. From the beginning of the seventh century onwards the African churches were in a moribund condition and by the end of the century had almost vanished. A small Moorish Church survived, but even this was finally swept away by the Turks in the sixteenth century.

Now that the Church had to endure the horrors of invasion and terrible persecution is perfectly true; that it was at times woefully weak morally is also true. But these things were not the main causes of its collapse. The churches of North Africa were extinguished because, as Mr. Holme says, 'they were the Churches of a party and not of a people; they appealed to the civilized Romans alone and not to the Barbarian Moors. . . . When the Saracen invasion came, the Romanized inhabitants fled, and like the Jews of old were spread over the face of the world; as the Roman community dispersed, the Church dispersed and the disintegration of the Imperial power meant the disintegration of the ecclesiastical system also. Some few Christians remained when their brethren were gone and these managed to preserve their separate existence with occasional help from more prosperous communions. Probably Moorish by blood, they displayed a marvellous resolution, and at times were even able to defy their persecutors; but their numbers were too small for them ever to become a lasting power and in 1583 the Turks swept away for ever the last vestiges of the Church of Africa. . . . There can be no doubt that the African Churches were destroyed not because of their failings, not because they were corrupt but because they failed to reach the hearts of the true natives of the Province' (*Op. cit.* 253–4).

These examples of past failures must have their interest for missionary leaders at the present time. To win members, to gain territorial successes, to grow in power and influence—these are not the matters of primary importance. As Canon F. R. Barry says, 'That the Church should cover the earth's surface with an organization of Christians is not enough. Its task is to redeem the world's life' (*The Relevance of the Church*, 228). The Church must beware of simply adopting the methods of the colonial administrator or of becoming identified with a particular race or culture. Hers is the task of penetrating ever deeper into the life of a people until the manifold functions of that life in time, become increasingly, in Canon Barry's phrase 'the vehicle of the life eternal' (*Ib.* 229).

◆

The Value of the New Testament for the Christian Church.

By the Reverend Alfred E. Garvie, D.D., D.Th., London.

In a previous article I endeavoured to state the value of the Old Testament in view of current depreciation, and even opposition to its use. At first consideration there does not seem any similar reason for dealing with the New Testament. On closer scrutiny, however, more reasons than one can be given for asking the question: Are there not movements and tendencies within and outside of the Church which should lead us to a closer study and thus a higher appreciation of what the New Testament not only does, but can mean in informing, correcting, and confirming the Christian faith? The scholarship of to-day devotes itself so largely to what one may call the *microscopic* study that it often neglects the *telescopic*; it hangs on so much to the parts that it is in danger of losing hold of the whole; the defect of the expert often is that in learning more and more about less and less, he is learning less and less about more and more. I do not depreciate this meticulous accuracy, and so far as I am able, I keep myself informed as to the methods and results of this specialized study. My own interest and activity have been of a wider range—religion as one of the normal functions of human personality; Christianity as the sole religion which can claim to be universal extensively and intensively as meeting the religious need of the whole manhood of mankind; the Old Testament as the record of the preparatory progressive, and the New Testament of the final consummatory revelation of God to mankind; Jesus the Christ or Lord as the focus of divine truth and grace in human history, the 'same yesterday, to-day, yea, and for ever.'

It is not the record of the Synoptic Gospels alone which must be set against the challenge of the historical reality of Jesus, which, however, is less prevalent than it was a generation ago. The records of the Early Church, especially the Pauline letters, Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Romans, are unintelligible unless a personality, that cannot be measured by ordinary historical standards, was the real object of the common faith of the Christian community. The tendency to concentrate on the Synoptic Figure, and to suppose that the whole edifice of the Christian Church will totter to its fall if the foundation of the Synoptic Gospels is weakened, is encouraged by a section within the Christian Church itself, who might without injustice be described as adherents of the *Jesus* religion, for the living Christ of the Apostolic Faith, if not explicitly, is implicitly denied; and it is the teacher, example, and companion of the earthly ministry, who is accepted as leader in the things of God and goodness, although He is not confessed Lord as the Christian Church means that title in its creed. Such discipleship must not be despised, for that is how the Christian community began; but there it did not end, nor can this creed be accepted as adequate to explain the Christian Church in its ministry as the body of Christ, the habitation of His Spirit to the world. In Christian morals this restriction has its dangers; Jesus was not a legislator as was Moses; the Sermon on the Mount is not the Christian code, as was the Law associated with Mount Sinai. The Synoptists do present us with a historical personality who does seem great enough in the impression He made, the influence He wielded, the confidence and devotion He inspired, to remain the object of the faith of His disciples, despite the tragic disappointment of their hopes in His Cross, great enough to make possible the expanded faith in His Resurrection as the Risen Lord, great enough to be the source of the creative epoch begun at Pentecost.

It is to be remembered that the Synoptic Gospels are not impartial contributions to biography, but were written because of that faith, and in order to preserve, diffuse, and confirm that faith. We must take the historical reality as a whole, as the New Testament presents it. I have tried to follow as closely as I could the course of the literary and historical criticism of the Gospels, the two source hypothesis (Mark and Q) the four sources (Mark, Q, M, L), and now *Formgeschichte*; but for my present purpose I do not need to enter into the minutiæ, but must content myself with two remarks. First, I marvel at the confidence with which some scholars distinguish what Jesus could have said and could not have said. There is the objective test of the conditions under which, and the persons to whom He was speaking. There are sayings irrelevant to the immediate situation, and anticipatory of later developments. But, if we take due account of His greatness for the reasons given above, we shall be less ready to measure Him by the contemporary standards of moral or religious discernment, we shall beware of assuming as artificial ornaments of hero-worship words and deeds which make more intelligible the faith of which He was the object. Secondly, we shall stress the first word *form* in the compound *Formgeschichte*. We need not deny that the tradition about Him may have been affected in transmission by the contemporary literary forms, although I am not always convinced by the ingenuity of the exponents of this method. But granting the legitimacy of the method, which is by no means accepted without reserves by equally competent scholars, using Samson's riddle :

> From the eater came something to eat,
> From the strong came something sweet
> (Jg 14[14], Moffatt),

we can get out of this criticism a confirmation of the faith in Jesus, and using its heifer for *our* plough (v.[18]) we may call attention to the fact that it was a widely diffused common *faith* (Streeter's hypothesis suggests four different local sources), which used these forms. If we compare the historical personality which emerges from these traditions with the heroes of the tales cited as parallels in the *forms*, we shall not regard Him as only one of them ; and still more, if we do not sever, as we have no right to sever, the Jesus of history from the Christ of faith.

On the other hand, we must with equal decisiveness oppose the tendency to let the Jesus of history fall into the background, and to form a theology about the Christ of faith inconsistent with the facts of the Jesus of history. A great many years ago a marked New Testament was issued, in which the texts setting forth the plan of salvation were underlined. Great was my surprise to find how little of the gospel was discovered in the Gospels. There is a narrow evangelicalism, which depends on Pauline texts often taken out of their context, and dogmatically and not historically interpreted, which often much needs the moral correction of the Synoptic Gospels. Again, the ecclesiastical dogma of the person of Christ, while affirming the humanity of Jesus, goes metaphysically far beyond the metaphysics which appear in the Johannine and the Pauline interpretation. In our Christology we need to go back to the *whole* New Testament—Gospels and Epistles—to get the historical reality of Jesus Christ our Lord in its unity and consistency.

I have just spent four days in reading a manuscript of a history of Christian doctrine and practice up to the Reformation. The impression made upon me was that God's Spirit did not abandon the Church, but divine truth and grace were preserved ; and we must not assume, as an extreme Protestantism seems to do, that the Holy Spirit withdrew between the first and the fifteenth century with only a rare occasional activity in the Church ; nor yet that all the developments, theological and ecclesiastical, were aberrations and corruptions, and had no necessity and justification in changing historical conditions. Nevertheless the conclusion was also fixed upon me, that, making full allowance for local and temporary modes of presentation, it is the New Testament which needs to be applied to the history of the Church as the permanent and universal standard to determine what is, and is not Christian in our religion and morals. As the volume, entitled *Convictions*, which summarizes the replies of the churches represented to the Reports of the Lausanne Conference (1927), clearly shows there is little (or no) inclination for such a return to the historical sources, and an assumption that current doctrines and practices are to continue the final authority. There can be little hope for the United Church unless the churches go beyond their historical divisions to the one body presented in the New Testament. In the German churches there seems to be an increase of what has always repelled me in many German theological works, much as I owe to them, a servile subjection to Luther. Great as Luther was, he was not great enough to give us the complete Christ. On the Continent there is a return to Calvin, which has also its advocates among us. Great as Calvin was, I do not find in him much that Jesus gives me. To go to the New Testament for proof-texts for Lutheranism or Calvinism is to get far less of its value than an impartial, scholarly, historical study can give us. We must not imitate the arrogance of some sects who claim to be nothing else than 'Christians' or 'Disciples,' and have often proved more sectarian than any of the great historical churches.

A return does not mean a literal imitation in creed, code, polity, or ritual. There has been progress, there must be progress, for one age could not, and did not in experience or interpretation exhaust the riches of truth and grace in the revelation of God and redemption of man in Christ. We have not exhausted our understanding of the New Testament. Let us recall how much the rediscovery of the idea of the Kingdom of God meant two generations ago for the thought and the life of the Church, and how much we have advanced in the interval in our understanding of that idea. I believe that we may have a similar gain in trying to understand the idea of the Son of Man; we must let the scholars tell us what the term meant in *Daniel* or in *Enoch*, but we must exercise our discernment to discover the mind of Jesus concerning it. I have been led to a conclusion which seems of value to theology and ethics.

If Christ rose from the dead, and if the Spirit was given to the Church, then we must treat the experience which is interpreted by the Pauline and the Johannine literature as the continuation of the earthly ministry of Jesus in a wider range and a greater effectiveness of divine truth and grace for the saving of men. In the teaching of Jesus scholarship enables us to reconstruct the historical situation and to separate the temporal and local husk of contemporary thought and life from the permanent and universal verities and realities of the eternal God as mediated to human experience in the living Christ through the Holy Spirit. There are in Paul things hard to be understood; he has suffered much from some of his interpreters; he shows Jewish limitations from which Jesus is free; as in his lifetime so till now he excites prejudices and hostility. But 'the earthen vessel' cannot hide from spiritual discernment the personal greatness of the man, and the marvel of the new creation wrought in him through the grace of Christ. Surely in His captive, Christ celebrates His triumph (2 Co 2[14]). While in my book on *The Beloved Disciple* I tried to distinguish the reminiscences of the witness from the reflexions which grew out of these reminiscences, yet we need not regard the second as of less value than the first. It was in an intimate communion with the Risen Lord that by His Spirit the disciple was led into the fuller meaning of the words which he had heard. Were spiritual geniuses, heroes of faith, martyrs for truth, such as were these two believers, the victims of hallucinations? Was their Christ an illusion? Was their illumination by the Spirit of God only their own mental activity? A conclusion this is which seems to me absurd if God be in history at all. A return backward to the Apostolic Church and Christ as its centre means also an ascent upward, nearer to the mind, heart and will of God, and such an ascent makes us surer of God.

I must close with the affirmation that what meets us, subdues us, commands us in the New Testament is not merely a historical, but a suprahistorical reality, not the temporal phenomena only but the eternal noumenon (to borrow Kant's distinction). The eternal reality of the love of God, mediated historically in the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ is experienced individually and corporately in the common possession of the Holy Spirit, in, and yet above and beyond history; 'the white radiance of eternity' is here seen streaming through the many coloured dome of time (using Shelley's metaphor). Just as philosophy cannot logically demonstrate the existence of God, although it can show that faith is not unreasonable, so historical study cannot demonstrate that the Jesus of history is the Christ of faith, although it can show a continuity of events, and still less that in the Christ of faith God Himself is present and active, redeeming the world from sin and reconciling the world unto Himself. A comparison of Jesus as historically apprehended with other religious teachers to prove His supremacy has a legitimate place in Christian apologetics. For Christian dogmatics the Incarnate Word, the Christ of faith, is no doctrine about God, (our comprehension of the revelation is often too intellectualist); it is the Living Mighty Word of God in action and passion saving to the uttermost all who come to God through Him.

Of all the men whom I have met, none more impressed me with his massive greatness than did Dr. Dale of Birmingham; and for him Christianity was not the leadership of the historical Jesus only, but the fellowship of the living Christ as Saviour and Lord; and that it must be if the Church is to recover her vitality and vigour. We may have our doubts whether, if the historical evidence were lost, the present witness of believers would suffice to preserve the faith as he believed, for after all the redemptive revelation was given in the history, of which the New Testament is the record, and a return to the record is a necessity for the confirmation of the faith. On the other hand, however, that the faith not merely survives, but lives with a life that is not of man but of God, may strengthen us against doubts which a historical study that lacks spiritual discernment may leave. What Dr. Dale affirmed the Reformers described as *the inward witness of the Holy Spirit*. We cannot be too grateful to our scholars, nor use their labours too diligently in our study of the New Testament; but we need the seers and the saints (there are scholars who are that also); and their witness of what Christ has proved to them and made of them, if confirmed in our own experience, can alone disclose to us the value of the New Testament as a historical record bringing God to us in grace that we might be brought to God in faith in Jesus the Christ our Lord.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

A Four-in-Hand.

By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Lisbon.

> 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength.'—Mk 12[30].

One very rarely sees a coach-and-four nowadays. They vanished from the highways of England a hundred years ago, and are now only to be seen in Epsom at the Derby, or at the Annual Meet of the Four-in-Hand Club in Hyde Park. That is a sight worth seeing, and as each team drives in, one doesn't know which to admire most—the shining coach, the glittering harness, the beautiful horses, or the skill of the driver. To see them helps one to realize the vanished days of a hundred years ago, when the sound of the horn made sleepy villages wake and spring to life, and the coming of the coach was the event of the week; and when the fastest things on the road were the coach from Glasgow to Edinburgh, which did the journey in eight hours; and the coach from Edinburgh to London, which did the journey in eight days!

Well, the railways took travellers from the roads and the motor car put them back again; and what our forefathers thought dangerously fast, we, who train from Edinburgh to London in seven hours and fly to America in thirty-five hours, would think a very 'slow-coach' indeed.

Yet travelling by coach must have had its pleasures in summer, and its discomforts in winter; and if you want to realize the one, turn up your *Martin Chuzzlewit* and drive with Tom Pinch from Salisbury to London; and if you want to feel the other, turn up *Nicholas Nickleby* and travel with Nicholas and Squeers from London to Greta Bridge.

It must be a thrilling experience to drive 'four-in-hand'—to hold the reins on each just right, to hold back the horse that is too eager, to brisk up the horse that likes to slack and let the others do the work, to have them all pulling equally, not as four separate horses but as a team. It must be very difficult. In fact I know it is, for I have been driving a four-in-hand all my life! *And so have you!* Yes, it's true: a four-in-hand that neither steam-engine, nor motor car, nor aeroplane will ever put off the highway of life. Here is your team and mine and any man's: 'all thy *Heart*, all thy *Soul*, all thy *Mind*, all thy *Strength*.'

What is religion? It is the love of God. God is Love. Every touch of God on our life, gentle or hard, what He gives and what He withholds is love. Our answer is to love God so that all we do or think or say is ruled by love to God.

But how? In our love to God heart and soul, mind and strength, are each to have its place, and all to pull together like a well-driven team. Let us look at the team one by one.

To love 'with all thy heart'—what does this mean? It means without reserve, not keeping anything back, ungrudgingly, not just so far up to a limit, but without limit. It means loving not for what you will get out of it, neither for hope of reward nor for fear of punishment, but just loving because you love. Love doesn't calculate and measure; it doesn't invest; it gives and goes on giving, as God does. That is to love God 'with all your heart.'

'With all thy soul'—that means worship. There are people who say 'my religion is doing good,' and they have no time, and see no need, for worship. They are good and kind. But 'doing good' isn't religion: it's only a bit of it. It's only one horse out of a team of four, and a coach doesn't go as well as it should when only one out of four is pulling. A four-cylinder car doesn't go well if it's only firing on one cylinder. Therefore we must keep a place for worship, which is our soul's loving service to God.

'With all thy mind'—that means that love must be intelligent. We must think about God, and try to think rightly. How much thought do you give to choosing a birthday present for your father or mother! That is loving with your mind—thoughtful love. That sort of love we owe to God who gave us minds to know His truth and to think the thoughts of Christ.

'With all thy strength'—that means service: doing something for God because you love God, just as love for father or mother, or anybody, makes you glad and willing to do things for them. That is what shows and proves love. It is easy to say 'I love God,' and it may be true, but what proves it is what you are doing for Him.

There, then, is your 'four-in-hand.' See that each is pulling his weight, and all pulling together, none 'out-of-hand.' The romance of the stage-coach is gone for ever from our highways, but the romance of this will never vanish from life's highway, at the end of which is the Heavenly City and the Father's Home.

Saint Swithin's Day.

By the Reverend Harold Derbyshire, Harrogate.

'I will give you rain in due season.'—Lv 26[4].

In the middle of July there occurs a saint's day which is never, so far as I can discover, celebrated with special services or festivities. Nobody is given a holiday. In fact, people look forward to it somewhat fearfully.

The saint is Saint Swithin, and his day is the 15th of July. There is a saying, which you may possibly know, that if it rains on St. Swithin's Day it will rain for forty days afterwards. Now forty days is a long time, and forty days from 15th July takes us nearly to the end of August, including the time during which most of us are having our summer holiday. So it is not much wonder that those who believe in the truth of this saying are anxious to see what sort of weather it is on St. Swithin's Day, and that they are very gloomy if it happens to be wet.

Who was Saint Swithin, and why should his name be associated with wet weather?

You may think that he must have been a sour and unpleasant sort of man, but actually he seems to have lived a useful life, and to have been greatly loved by everybody. He was Bishop of Winchester over a thousand years ago, and he was well known in his time as a builder of churches and bridges. He was a great friend of King Ethelwulf, the father of Alfred the Great, but he was a very humble man. When he came to die, in the year 862, he wanted his grave to be, as he said, in 'a vile and unworthy place' in the churchyard, and not inside the church, where in those days the rich and notable people were buried.

A hundred years later, however, the monks of Winchester thought that some greater honour was due to their patron saint, and so they decided to remove his coffin into the cathedral. All preparations were made for this to be done, with splendid ceremony, on 15th July, but on that day it began to rain so hard that the roads were rushing torrents. They had to put off the ceremony until the following day, but it was still raining then, and the day after, and it went on raining for so long that, in the end, after forty days, they changed their minds, and left the good bishop in peace in the place where he had wanted to be buried. Immediately, the rain ceased.

So now, they say, if it rains on 15th July, it will rain for forty days afterwards. As the old rhyme has it:

> Saint Swithin's Day, if thou dost rain,
> For forty days it will remain;
> Saint Swithin's Day, if thou be fair,
> For forty days 't will rain na mair.

I don't take very much notice of this saying myself. I think it must have been invented by some very melancholy individual, and I don't believe the good Saint Swithin would have approved of it. As a matter of fact, we do often have plenty of rain in the month of July. I dare say, if you were to go about looking for a spot of rain, you would find some on most days. But is that a sensible thing to do? Is it not far better to go about looking for gleams of sunshine even on a really wet day?

That is the worst of this saying about St. Swithin's. When there is the tiniest drop of rain on 15th July, it makes people feel ever so downhearted, and they are quite sure there will be no more fine weather until the holidays are over. Every day then looks 'unsettled,' and, forty days later, they are quite sure it has been a very wet summer. Certainly, they have had a miserable one themselves, looking for rain.

Jesus Christ always looked for the best in everything, and he sought the best in the people He met. He said that the boastful, uncertain Simon would be worthy of his new name, Peter, the 'Rock-man.' He helped a sinful woman called Mary to have faith that she would become good and pure and true. He made the lonely Zaccheus see that, even if he had not a friend, he could *be* one.

Rain and sunshine are both blessed things, after all. Let us be thankful to God for all kinds of weather, for we need them all. And, if it should happen to rain on St. Swithin's Day, don't let it worry you. Forget all about it, and enjoy the pleasant days that are sure to come!

The Christian Year.

Fifth Sunday after Trinity.

Preoccupied.

'I am doing a great work, so that I cannot come down.'—Neh 6[3].

Nehemiah is one of a group of Bible characters to whom we usually do a good deal less than justice.

He accomplished a much greater work and in the doing it exhibited much higher qualities than is commonly acknowledged. We should all of us gain from bettering acquaintance with this brave, God-fearing man. As a great scholar, now gone hence, writes: 'Nehemiah is one of the most engaging personalities in the Old Testament.' That uprightness, that resolute hope, faith, and courage—to spend half an hour beside them is like filling the lungs with heather-scented air.

Everything for Nehemiah, as the Bible pictures him, began with an act of sacrifice. He occupied a high office at the court of Persia, and his obvious rectitude had given him the king's ear. No man's prospects could be brighter. Then all at once bad news came from Jerusalem and changed everything on the spot. He was not a prophet, he was not a priest, he professed no divine revelations; he was just a brave believer in the living God, who, at duty's call, threw up the safe profit of a comfortable position and went down into the trenches with the men.

Arrived in Jerusalem, with a statesman's eye he instantly perceived that the first step was to get the city's walls rebuilt. And our text reveals him at a particularly interesting point. Zion was beginning to show something like her former self. That was no welcome sight to the brigand chiefs who sacked the district at intervals. Sanballat and Tobiah, leaders in that bad work, felt that either they or Nehemiah must go. First they tried a charge of treason. It was a bogey that already had done good service, but made no impression now. The feeble jests of ridicule were their next weapon. At last, in desperation, they turned to the assassin's dagger. Their plan was to decoy Nehemiah out to one of the neighbouring villages, and make away with him. As a first choice, they would ask him to join their party. But it was all in vain. He had only one answer, repeated once, twice, thrice, four times, with unyielding decision: 'I am doing a great work, so that I cannot come down.' Some lessons are here which we might well ponder.

1. Here, for example, is *a rebuke to false humility*. Nehemiah's reply to the treacherous invitation has in it a note of confidence. The man realized the grandeur of his task.

Is not that a note far too apt to die out of our thought as Christian men and women? 'To me, who am less than the least of all saints,' said the Apostle, 'is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ.' To think well of our own gifts is one thing; to think well of our task as believers in Jesus Christ is quite another, which swallows up all selfish and petty vanity in its disinterested ardour, and makes the man who merely by himself might faint or tremble, to be courageous as fire and persistent as iron when battling or toiling in the Redeemer's name.

Look now at false humility: see as an emotion how barren it is! We are all more or less infected with it. Christian people are to be met with not infrequently whose attitude to the greater possibilities of life is this: Do not look to me for any great eminence in goodness. I am made of very common clay. We indemnify ourselves for having failed to grow in patience or kindness or self-control by pleading that we are not built that way, or that our life at home makes goodness difficult, or even—God forgive us—that what saves is not character, but simple faith. The Spirit of God beckoning us forward we meet with the plea that these shining graces are not for us.

Is there anything that will put right this error? Is there a way of getting out afresh into the full sweep of God's intention? Yes, there is! It is that we should realize anew the greatness of the task God's love has committed to us, and that a worthy conception of it should go with us through our lives. We can banish false humility about goodness by realizing the stake Jesus Christ has in each one of us. The task which God has put us all—without exception—into this strange but wonderful life of ours to get accomplished is to know Himself and in that knowledge build up Christian character; shall we not feel how great this task is?

That thought has also a direct bearing on the conflict with evil to which every Christian is committed. The fight proceeds night and day in our inward life; it rages all around in the world. Let us never consent to regard that struggle in any aspect as a trivial thing. Real issues are being fought out; action is abundantly worth while. It may be the attempt to conquer a bad habit; it may be an attack on the vested interests of evil; whatever it be, the one certain thing is that it is never unimportant. It is the warfare of God; less than that we cannot say. If we belong to Him, and if He is the supreme antagonist of evil, He struggles in us and by our side. Do not let us be satisfied with prudential considerations but be brave enough to take the highest ground and hold that in this matter we are in league with God.

2. Again, as we listen to Nehemiah's words, we perceive that here is *the true defence against temptation*. It was a man absorbed in a great purpose who gave the reply 'I cannot come down.'

Who is the man that drifts into shipwreck and collapses under the pressure of crowding temptations? Is it not the unpreoccupied man? Is it not the man whose heart is empty of any commanding desire that links him up with God? One of the simplest and most familiar experiments in a physical laboratory is to make a vacuum in a vessel with fragile walls, and then see the weight of the surrounding atmosphere crush in its sides; and just so, take out of a man's heart the convictions and aspirations by means of which we grasp God and feel life through Him to be a noble thing and the forces of evil will batter him to fragments.

Look now on the other picture. Nehemiah is the man who moves through temptation straight and safe. The student who loves his work commonly surmounts the perils of college life; the mechanic with his eye on efficiency ignores the traps that wait for the loafing idler. Every one knows that absorption in an honourable career will render a man invulnerable to many poisoned arrows that fill the air.

But is this enough to lift us right above the power of evil? Far from it. The student's heart may fill with envy or malice though his life is clean; the mechanic may be a self-seeker though he spends not a penny at the public-house; and selfishness and malice kill the soul and cut us off from God. Holier and more inspiring motives by far than those of personal profit or prudence must be put within men's reach, if sin is to be swept clean out of their heart as well as vice out of their life.

Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control,
These three alone lead life to sovereign power.

And even yet that is not enough; it does not touch our sorest need. We do not cast any kind of scorn upon the moral attainments of men who have not learnt righteousness at the feet of Christ. But we do say that if men are to be made *good*—not in the sense in which any decently respectable person, especially if he has an easy temper, is christened by that title, but as the Bible employs the word—we want to give them an inner inexhaustible spring of moral inspiration and power. We want, in short, to unite them with God by faith and love. What they need is to be imbued with the certainty that in living here, toiling, enduring, praying, helping others and being helped, they are engaged in a great work, and that God is engaged in it along with them. Once reach that conviction, once take up, humbly and resolutely, the task of learning to know and love God and thereby to grow in strength of character and ability to serve, and we may walk unscathed through temptation's fires. Is not Christ's own life the very picture of that? Do we not behold in Him the serene, preoccupied mind of which we have been speaking? Who can be blind to the unswerving tranquil power with which Jesus Christ moved across this world of men, travelling on to death and triumph with the calm majesty of a planet as it sails unhasting, unresting, over the midnight sky? It is a secret we too can learn from Him.

3. And once more, we have here *the right answer to suggestions of spiritual compromise.* Nehemiah would not parley. He was well aware that men fall, not because accident has for the moment placed them in danger, but because foolishly they stay on beside the evil thing. A man may plunge his hand in molten lead for one second, and take no hurt; if it remain longer, the metal will bring away skin and flesh.

Therefore, when the world tables one of its proposals—such as that religion and business have nothing to do with each other—proposals that look so simple and are so false, there is just one right thing to do: refuse to listen, and then prove our refusal sincere by cutting off communications. No experiments with evil. No lowering of the standard. No going down to the level of a not over-scrupulous worldly practice. They may promise us large profits, but we have a far greater business in hand than making our pile: we are called to live in fellowship with God.[1]

Sixth ~~Sunday after~~ Trinity.

The Great Leader.

'And I saw heaven ~~opened, and~~ behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war.'—Rev 19[11].

Christ is here presented to us as a *Leader*—as *the* Leader, we should say, of a great host who are carrying out God's purpose in history, fighting His battles, overthrowing His enemies, establishing His Kingdom. For He is not alone, but followed by a great host of other horsemen, also on white horses.

We live in an age when leadership seems unusually in demand. In great European countries, indeed, the word has supplied the title for the chief officers of State. It seems as though there had been a marked shifting of sentiment in the public mind from loyalty to an institution or body to loyalty to individual persons.

---

[1] H. R. Mackintosh, *Sermons*, 45.

There are two things in this tendency which are specially remarkable. One is that it seems to cut right across the actual form which social progress at the moment is taking. For nothing has been more plain in recent years than the growing complexity of social organizations. The individual finds every department of his life more and more affected, and to some extent controlled, by the society he belongs to. Freedom in the old sense of the word, which meant freedom for the individual to do anything he pleased, so long as it was not criminal, has nearly gone: we have all become parts of an organism, bearing one another's burdens whether we like to or not; and every now and again we are haunted by the fear that what we have been caught up into may prove to be not so much an organism as a machine. Perhaps, indeed, it is as a reaction, half conscious, half unconscious, against that fear, that this modern craving for leadership has arisen.

The other thing to be noticed is that the leadership which is demanded is of the kind that exacts sacrifices of its followers, and imposes discipline on them. That appears less surprising if we reflect that the restraint put by modern social organization on individual freedom is largely negative; you *may not* do this, that, or the other without the permission of some authority. What people want is to be given a *positive* aim and direction, and to be shown what they *must* do; and if the cause and call are clear enough, they will shrink from no sacrifice in the doing of it. Most of us know that sonnet of Rupert Brooke's where he describes how he felt this *ennui* of the world in the rich and prosperous years before 1914, and how he exulted in the clear call to struggle and service, even though it would probably mean death:

Now, God be thanked Who has matched us with His hour,
  And caught our youth, and wakened us from sleeping,
With hand made sure, clear eye, and sharpened power,
  Glad from a world grown old and cold and weary. . . .

We know now too much of war to make that particular moment of Rupert Brooke's exhilaration our own. But that there are many like him who are longing to 'turn, as swimmers into cleanness leaping'—of that there is no doubt. And those who feel it are among the best elements in our country.

How is this desire for leadership satisfied? Does not this picture of St. John's give us just the qualities which mark the Christian leader? We say 'the Christian leader,' because leaders arise from time to time who are in no sense Christians and who lead people into false paths. Thus Machiavelli in *The Prince* wrote: 'Our experience has been that those Princes who have done great things have held good faith of little account and have known how to circumvent the intellect of men by craft, and in the end have overcome those who relied on their word.'

But that is not the kind of leadership which has served the purpose of God, or can be brought under the banner of Christ. For His name is '*Faithful and True*.' It may be right for a man to break his word, if he gave it under duress; or circumstances may make it impossible of fulfilment. But such exceptions only prove the rule, at least for the followers of Christ, that a man's Yea should be Yea, and his Nay Nay, and never more so than when he is called to lead others. The point needs emphasizing to-day in a generation which is so largely given over to propaganda—to the making of it or to the hearing of it. Aldous Huxley, we find, goes so far as to say in his recent book, *Ends and Means*: 'At no period of the world's history has organized lying been practised so shamelessly, or so efficiently, or on so vast a scale as by the political or economic dictators of the present century.' It seems he is right. And the result is that the habits of accuracy and truthfulness of speech, which are among the very sinews of society, are being eaten away. People are sometimes apt to forget that these elementary virtues are part of the teaching of our Lord Himself in the Sermon on the Mount.

And secondly, the White Horseman of the Apocalypse is one who demands sacrifices of His followers. He is 'clothed with a vesture dipped in blood.' The picture is of One who advances, and has advanced, through great *struggle* to his victorious end. And what thing in life worth having can be had without struggle or conflict? Nothing—literally nothing. Not the poetry of a Lucretius or a Milton, not the paintings of a Michel Angelo, not the music of a Beethoven, not the serenest statue of a Pheidias, none of these but was the fruit of elemental struggle. And so it is with the highest of all achievements—the achievement of a good life. On this score our Lord held out to His disciples no prospects of exemption. 'The disciple shall be as the Master,' He said, buffeted in the same conflict as He, scarred in the same struggle, bearer of the same Cross. One of the great tests of a leader is his power of exacting sacrifice from his friends, of calling on them for hard things, of getting the last ounce of service out of them; as when Garibaldi, as he marched out of San Marino, where he had arrived with 1500 men after a month's ceaseless marching, expecting safety and rest, cried out—'Whoever wishes to follow me, I offer him fresh battles, suffering and exile; treaties with the foreigner never.'

In one of our Collects we pray that God will 'stir up the wills of His faithful people.' That gives the clue to the nature of the conflict we are engaged in—it is a spiritual, personal conflict. It is the fashion nowadays to say that the idea of temptation, and of spiritual conflict as we find it in religion, is out of date; and that the real issues in the world to-day are economic and political. Don't believe it. To quote Aldous Huxley again—a modern of the moderns. The main theme of his book is just this—that you cannot have a better world without better people. He discusses revolution, Communism, State planning, and many other devices for making the world a better place, and says: 'No. You have got to change human nature—to give people new hearts and wills first.'

But more than that—he draws attention to two very interesting facts. The first is a fact established by the science of sociology. It is that only in those societies where the lusts of the flesh are controlled—only there do you get sufficient social and mental energy to create or maintain civilization. And the second is a fact of history—that, when this social and mental energy is produced, it has been just as often used for bad ends as for good. It needs therefore to be guided into fruitful channels. Mankind needs not only self-control, but also and equally leadership in the right direction.

And so we come back to this vision from which we started—the vision of our Leader in the Apocalypse, and recognise in His figure and His accoutrement the form of the Son of God.[1]

Seventh Sunday after Trinity.

The Nature of the Knowledge of God.

'My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge.'—Hos 4⁶.

'For I desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings.'—Hos 6⁶.

One of the greatest gains from the modern study of the Bible has been its emphasis on the large part played by human experience in the revelation of God.

In the case of Amos the critics have brought out the influence of his ancestry and manner of living upon his message and upon his thinking. Much of the imagery in his writing is drawn from Nature, and his simple early life had, no doubt, much to do with the directness of his vision and speech. Amos will not hear of the existence of other gods. Jehovah is the God of the whole earth.

In Hosea we note the influence of his domestic tragedy on his message. In seeking to understand his own tragedy, he had been compelled to realize that his wife had never really known him.

It is with this background of experience that the Prophet interprets the relation between Israel and his God. Israel had never known the real character of Jehovah, and consequently had never known what He required of them. He desired mercy and not sacrifice; He hungered to be understood of them and known, and they gave Him burnt offerings.

Hosea then shows how criminal is Israel's ignorance. It is no valid and sufficient excuse to say that they did not know, for they ought to have known. The facts are writ large on the face of their entire history. 'When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt. . . . By a prophet the Lord brought Israel out of Egypt, and by a prophet was he preserved. . . . And now they sin more and more, and have made them molten images of their silver. . . . Yet I am the Lord thy God from the land of Egypt, and thou shalt know no god but me. . . . I did know thee in the wilderness, in the land of great drought. According to their pasture so were they filled, and their heart was exalted; therefore have they forgotten me. . . . O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in me is thine help.' We get the whole sorry story of a nation's blind indifference to the unfailing love of their God in Hosea's own graphic words.

Both Gomer and Israel knew the facts but they lacked the vision which interprets them. The sin of Israel as of Gomer has its rise in this primal ignorance, this stupidity. Throughout the prophecies Hosea continually recurs to this charge.

Whilst sin is the outcome of ignorance, Hosea also says that the ignorance of Israel is none the less partly the outcome of their sin. Vice and sin sap the roots of intelligence, and a vicious people are sure to become a stupid people. Spiritual blindness is one of the gravest, as it is one of the surest, penalties for our sins.

Hosea also condemns the negligence of the priests and blames them largely for the state of the people. Those who ought to have led and strengthened the people in the straight path have, for gain, encouraged them in idolatry and crookedness.

---

[1] E. G. Selwyn, *The White Horseman*, 199.

Hosea was in many respects a pathfinder for the Kingdom of God. To him we are indebted for some of the most fruitful and worthy conceptions of God before the New Testament times. He was the first preacher of repentance, the first Evangelist of Israel, and the first to preach 'God is Love.' He was also the first to base religion clearly on intellect and conscience rather than on ritual and custom. He insists that the basis of any true religion or worship is a real knowledge of God, a moral and spiritual knowledge of, and relation to, God. This worship of God in turn will affect man's relation to his fellows, a relation that will be interpreted by religion and conscience.

This conception is very close to the New Testament idea of the Kingdom of God. The complaint of God has ever been, 'My people do not know, my people do not consider.' Jesus said that they did not know His Heavenly Father, and none were more ignorant than those zealous for His worship.

Very, very often Jesus was pained at the spiritual denseness and obtuseness of His chosen disciples. How often has the ignorance of the Church concerning the true character and revelation of God amounted to a caricature, and led to bitter and wicked persecution.

And what of ourselves? Even as Israel knew well the history of God's revelation in her past, so we know the history of God's incarnation in Christ and His Saviourhood. Yet we do not know if we only know the facts as facts, as a string of events, sayings, and incidents full of beauty and interest, but signifying nothing. Saul knew—and yet he did not know until he was stopped by a great light when on his way to Damascus. During the time of his persecution of the early Christians there is little doubt that he was as well informed as any of his victims as to the teaching of Christ and of the events in His life. Yet he did not know. Then it pleased God to reveal His Son to him, and his knowledge, which up to that point had been in a sense external, becomes internal. Even so, Christ tells us that we do not know the saving grace of God unless our knowledge is an inward, experimental knowledge; unless we live not only in, but by, the knowledge.

Hosea is the Evangelist of the Old Testament, putting the same stress on knowledge as did St. John the Evangelist of the New Testament. We do not know God unless we love Him, and yet again we do not know and love God if we love not our brother. 'He that saith he loveth God and hateth his brother is a liar, and the truth is not in him.'

So ever does a true knowledge of God lead us to repentance, and a growing knowledge means a continuous repentance. Only too often our knowledge of God is not a live progression from strength to strength, from glory to glory; it becomes dead and stale and conventional. If we are to realize how 'new every morning is the love our waking and uprising prove,' our knowledge of God must ever be renewed, and warm, and living. If our knowledge is to be a true knowledge, and not degenerate into hearsay and report, into a dealing in second-hand goods, our conscience must be quick and active, and our hearts kept pure and near to God. If we fail to maintain this daily walk with God, our knowledge becomes but the hearing of the ear and not the seeing with the eye. The true knowledge is what God desires. He wants, not sacrifices and burnt offerings, but a true love and knowledge of Himself. Our prayers and vows and works avail nothing to give Him pleasure and work out our redemption, if they are not the expression of these deeper relations and apprehensions of the spirit.

In Israel's case it was the prosperity and richness of his life in Canaan that caused him to forget God. Every soul is threatened with its own particular and peculiar danger. With one it is the burdens of adversity, with another it is the fascination of riches, a life crowded full of earth and the things that are seen. Every soul must seek precisely that wisdom it most needs, that knowledge of God and self that means its redemption, assured that he that asks shall receive, and the soul that seeks shall find.

May God grant we attain to, and maintain, this living knowledge of Himself.[1]

Eighth Sunday after Trinity.

The Certainty of the Faithful Seeker.

'And I said, Oh that I had wings like a dove! Then would I fly away, and be at rest.'—Ps 55^6 (R.V.).

These words of the Psalmist express feelings that are familiar to all of us that have passed beyond the years of childhood. We have all had our seasons of depression in which our thoughts have naturally expressed themselves in some such self-pitying cry.

The hermits of the East, the anchorites of the desert, the troubled souls that in all ages have sought a refuge in convents, monasteries, and retreats—all alike have shared the same trouble of heart as ourselves; and if our lives have taken different directions from theirs, it is not that our impulses or natures are different, but that our conceptions of duty have changed.

---

[1] A. Hird, *The Test of Discipleship*, 84.

We rightly condemn this desire of the Psalmist—a desire which he renounces later in the same psalm when he declares: 'Cast thy burden upon the Lord, and he shall sustain thee: he shall never suffer the righteous to be moved.'

This desire of the Psalmist, therefore, is not a legitimate one. But this conclusion naturally suggests the question: Has man any legitimate desires? Of course he has. To possess desires is an imperative need in man, not merely if he is to live well and nobly, but if he is to live at all.

There can be no progress in commerce and industry, in science, in art, in knowledge, in civilization, in morals, or religion, without desires. To possess desires is an imperative need of life itself. Now the things of this world are of very unequal moral worth; and hence it follows that, as men differ from each other in their desires, they differ in their moral standards. One man makes money his chief desire, another material comfort, another power, another science or knowledge, another art or music, another patriotism, another philanthropy.

Now it is clear that men differ essentially from each other according to the objects which they set before them; and, further, it is equally clear that none of these objects can ultimately satisfy the soul of man. The quest for satisfaction in the things of this world and its ever-recurring failure have led to effusions in all ages on the deceptiveness of human life. But, so far as this is true, it is men themselves that have made it so; for God has placed the issues of life and death in men's own hands.

However often the bitter lesson is driven home to the hearts of men, the rising generations always need to learn it afresh. The child longs for freedom from the restraints that beset it on every side: the youth longs for the tasks, responsibilities, and independence of manhood: but for the man who has fully entered on these the horizon has again shifted, and the vision that promised so much to the child, to the youth, and to the man, has already receded so far into the distance, that with multitudes the hope of any true blessedness is relinquished in despair. This is the destiny of all those whose chief aim and end are the temporary satisfactions of this world, and not the things of the Kingdom of God. Their hopes are built on wrong foundations. The only foundations on which we have a right to build are those that are spiritual. And if we build on such foundations, the edifice we rear thereon will not, like the things of this world, be flung in due course as waste upon the rubbish heaps of time.

But the lesson is one that is hard to learn, and man is at the best but a slow and backward pupil in the school of God.

In trouble he reverts to the old delusion and prays for the wings of a dove that he may fly into the wilderness and be at rest—a vain attempt; for the sorrows of a mind that is not stayed on God, and the griefs that obsess a faithless heart, cannot be cured by any change of place, or by fleeing the tasks that rightly devolve upon it.

We must be faithful where we are now, and here we must at all costs seek to carry the spirit of Christ into all our relations and dealings with our fellowmen. We must discharge our life's callings as unto God, and find therein the blessedness of heaven.

These simple truths need to be pressed home, and particularly in trade and commerce, because of the prevalent idea that Christ's teaching cannot be put into practice in business matters. From the industrial, political, and international strifes that are waged from time to time many would fain escape to some haven of rest, but the men who should lead their fellows in such struggles must not indulge in longings after another and easier lot, for these evils have arisen through unfaithfulness generation after generation, in our actual callings: we have discharged our duties as unto men and not unto God: we have given loose reins to our covetousness, or else we have buried our talent, and eaten the bread of idleness; and now is it strange that we are suffering from our self-indulgence, burdened with cares, personal, national, or international, that God has not laid upon us, and filled with desires that God can never bless? There is no remedy for these troubles save to bring God into our personal and national life.

And yet, though we admit these truths, the fallacy still persists in the hearts of men that their true blessedness can be created by more favourable seasons and scenes and circumstances. This fallacy is almost as old as time itself. It appears in the most ancient legends of the world, and is widely attested in its oldest and greatest literatures. It has given birth to great classics, such as the *Republic* of Plato and More's *Utopia*, and to lesser works in modern times.

But, though this conception is hopelessly wrong, though man's soul cannot be redeemed by merely changing or mending its surroundings, yet there is a right element in the universal longing of humanity for a changed environment. We can rightly long and work for a time when Christ's reign shall establish itself more and more in this life and on this earth, when the commonwealth under which we live will cherish and foster spiritual things, and furnish a fitting field for the manifestation of the best qualities within us, for the disinterested quest of knowledge and truth, for the fulfilment of equity and righteousness in all our dealings, man with man, class with class, state with state, for the realization of purity, and faith and love: in short, for the supersession of the kingdom of this world by the Kingdom of our Lord and His righteousness.

In the first chapters of Genesis the certainty of the triumph of righteousness is proclaimed in unforgettable words. In the great parable of the Creation in Gn 2 and 3, wherein an ancient Hebrew saint has recast a tradition of Babylon, and described the fall of man, the triumph of sin, and the expulsion of man from the presence of God, we find one of the notablest prophecies in all Old Testament literature. For when all is dark, and the hopes of humanity seem blasted for ever, the following sentence is pronounced by God on the prime agent of evil: 'I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, though thou shalt bruise his heel.' Here it is declared that man will never make terms with the sin that has brought about his fall and is doing so every day: though man's heel will be bruised in this strife, he will crush and destroy the very head of sin itself. Here is the unshatterable optimism of faith.

But, if this victory is to be won, it must be won by each and all of us in our several callings, and this victory can be won in various degrees even in the present life as the fruit of spiritual faithfulness.

If we seek the Kingdom of God and His righteousness we shall assuredly find it.

No man need ever fail to achieve the spiritual end he has laboured for. This is the one certainty in this most uncertain world. It may, indeed, be only in partial measure that he achieves it, but the partial achievement is an earnest, a divine pledge, of ever fuller achievement here and hereafter. We must give ourselves to the doing of our Father's business now, and not adjourn it to some more convenient season; for what are all these pleas of the shirking heart but vain flights into the wilderness in quest of a rest and peace the wilderness can never give? This is not the stuff of which Christ's soldier is made. He is assured that he can, because he ought. His is the invincible optimism of the victor who in the Book of Revelation is constantly described as 'he that overcometh,' and whose character could not be more fittingly described than in Browning's words:

One who never turned his back but marched
    breast forward,
  Never doubted clouds would break,
Never dreamed, though right were worsted, wrong
    would triumph,
Held we fall to rise, are baffled to fight better,
      Sleep to wake.[1]

---

[1] R. H. Charles, *Courage, Truth, Purity*, 119.

The Enigma of the Swords.

By the Reverend T. M. Napier, B.D., Glasgow.

Perhaps no other passage in the New Testament of equal import and brevity has puzzled exegetes more, or has been less satisfactorily elucidated, than that of Lk 22$^{35-38}$. This holds true of scholars on both sides of the line dividing the critical and the conservative schools. The following references offer a fair conspectus of varying views.

Wellhausen (*Das Evangelium Lucae*) finds in the passage an assembling of incongruous elements without inner connexion.[1] He is frankly expressive of his perplexity as to details, *e.g.* the significance of the appellation *Peter* in v.^{34} preceding.[2] He asks how the summons to the disciples to prepare with swords for 'a further and dangerous journey on an unsure way' can be based upon Jesus' prediction of His death (vv.[36. 37]), and adds, 'I cannot see it.' V.[35] though at variance with v.[36] refers equally with it to this equipment: 'If you have no sword buy one at any price, even at the sacrifice of the coat.' On the other hand, v.[38] disagrees with v.[36] since it declares two swords already provided. He sees discordance between v.[37] and v.[38]. The former says, 'I must die according to the Scripture'; the latter, 'Here are two swords. How does that fit?' Then, vv.[35. 36. 37. 38] stand in confused relation to one another. What is the way out? 'Probably v.[38] which looks on (ausschaut) to v.[49].' Wellhausen concludes that not the necessity of Scripture fulfilment but announcement of the danger of a clandestine attack must have originally stood in v.[37]. The disciples think they can defend themselves with 'ridiculously inadequate' means, 'but Jesus in sorrowful resignation declares that they will do (erklärt sie . . . für ausreichend), and lets the disciples have their way.' Wellhausen thinks that one would rather expect Jesus to say (v. [35]), 'Did I not before forbid you to carry even a staff? but now I command you to procure a sword'—this as a help to reconciling contradictions, and adds, 'Perhaps Luke had indeed this in mind, only he did not venture to alter the expression that already lay before him.'

---

[1] Sehr alte und sehr junge Elemente erscheinen öfters bei ihm gemischt, ohne dass der Versuch glückt, sie in inneren Konnex zu bringen.

[2] Was es auf sich hat . . . kann ich nicht sehen.

Loisy (*L'Évangile selon Luc*) regards v.[35] as a preamble conceived by Luke for the lesson which he wishes to introduce. Now (v.[36]) in changed circumstances 'the sword is going to be more indispensable than the cloak,' but the counsel 'concerns rather the dangers to come than an immediate obligation to arm.' The phrase about a sword is somewhat ambiguous (un peu équivoque) and the redactor could understand it figuratively more or less (plus ou moins metaphoriquement). To associate with Jesus the idea of armed defence would seem 'a supposition the more precarious in that the spirit of the Gospel is otherwise against it. . . . It must yet be admitted that the narrative is framed on the idea of such a resistance as that on which two swords should suffice,' and which actually took place later (vv.[49-51]), except as stopped by Jesus Himself. 'It might be possible to retain nothing of all that as historic (so Meyer). However the fact of the disciples' resistance to the arrest of Jesus may appear sufficiently consistent, and also their prompt rout . . . it would then be possible equally that . . . our evangelist has worked on a source in which (où) the disciples' resistance had been foreseen and even encouraged by Jesus. But it is possible finally, and perhaps nearer the truth (plus vraisemblable), that the Evangelist constructed awkwardly the whole present passage on the simple fact of the resistance attested in Mark's source' (14[46-50])—the latter 'rather a surprise event (coup de surprise) against which Jesus would not have been able to guard himself.'

'The things concerning me' (v.[37]) may be supposed added by the redactor to the previously constructed discourse. 'These are insertions written for the edification of the reader,' the whole being shaped by Luke or a redactor out of discordant materials. V.[38]: The disciples are regarded (censés) as struck only by the advice to arm: 'Here are two swords.' 'They are quite serious, and seem to be asking if there is need of more. . . . And he said unto them, It is enough.' 'The critics are indeed daring who presume to know (qui pensent savoir) what Jesus meant by that. It would be of most importance to know what the author wanted (s'est proposé) to make Jesus say.' Loisy calls the attitude attributed to Jesus 'pose convenue et artificielle,' by which the Evangelist means to explain the kind of prediction made for the future missionaries of Christ; the sword-stroke in Gethsemane; and the respect of Jesus for all constituted authorities.

In this class of commentators Montefiore may also be cited (*The Synoptic Gospels*). He is as much perplexed by the passage as the foregoing critics, and as dogmatic despite the fact that he does not, any more than they, offer a satisfactory explanation of it. Vv.[35. 36] cannot be connected with or refer to the same situation as is reflected in v.[38]. They cannot bid the disciples prepare for the arrest of Jesus and resist it, or what is the meaning of the reference to 10[4] and the contrast to it? What is the meaning of purse and wallet? V.[36] must refer to coming persecutions after Christ's death. One means of connecting v.[36] with v.[38] would be to suppose that the disciples misunderstood as usual what Jesus has said, and Jesus perceiving this says, 'It is enough,' half ironically, and breaks off the conversation.

Montefiore cites a number of other expositors whose judgments may be noticed. B. Weiss would regard the words of v.[36] as metaphorical and proverbial. Jesus means that He can no longer look after His disciples. J. Weiss attributes the contradiction which he finds in v.[36] to a mood and situation of Jesus which did not recur, in which He hopes that His disciples will and may battle through. Burkitt thinks it impossible to believe that Jesus' command to buy a sword was meant seriously and ascribes to Him a vein of tender and melancholy playfulness. Pfleiderer's view is that Jesus feared the weapon of some assassin but did not anticipate arrest. The sword passage is historical and important. All predictions about death put into the mouth of Jesus are spurious—prophecies after the event.

When we regard such exegeses I think we must be impressed more by the failure than the success of their attempted explications. They suggest doubts of Luke's intelligence or trustworthiness as a recorder; or of Jesus' understanding of, or adjustment to, the circumstances in which He finds Himself, or—and this is more serious still—of His consistency and loyalty to His previous teaching and ethic.

What of more conservative scholars? We find considerable difference of judgment among them also. There is fairly general agreement among all expositors that the phrase 'It is enough' of v.[38] refers not to the swords but to the conversation.[1] There is less agreement on the question whether the sword of v.[36] has a literal or figurative meaning. The puzzle remains, and the felt difficulty of reconciling Jesus' legislation for the self-defence of the disciples with the spirit of His gospel generally and with that of His particular utterances. Matthew Henry is naïve. While recalling that the sword of the spirit is to be the disciples' weapon, he yet regards Jesus as prevising a situation in which he that has no sword will find a great want of it, and adds, 'Christ wore none Himself, but He was not against His disciples wearing of them.' Alford interprets vv.[35. 36] as the rescinding by Jesus of His previous orders (Mt 10[8. 9] and Lk 9[3]). The disciples must now in their mission make use of common resources of sustenance and defence.[2] The New Testament Commentary (*Ellicott's*) seeks to relieve the passage of its ambiguity by suggesting that Jesus sadly, and yet, as it were, with gentle sympathy, accommodated His warnings to the disciples' fears and hopes. 'If they meant to trust in swords a time was coming when they would sorely need them.' 'It is enough' bears a touch of grave irony. 'The two words were enough, and more than enough for Him who did not mean them to use them at all.' Bruce (*Expositor's Greek Testament*) does not take the word about a sword as literal. It is a vivid way of intimating that the supreme crisis is now at hand. He yet interprets v.[36] as meaning, a *sword* is the one thing needful. Adeney (*The Century Bible*) takes a similar line. Jesus is legislating for altered circumstances and had not meant His utterances to be taken literally. Plummer (*International Critical Commentary*) finds no indication of any connexion of what precedes with v.[35], and frankly declares that what Jesus formerly forbade He now enjoins; yet thinks that there is some confusion in the tradition or the use to which Luke puts it. Christ does not mean that His followers are to repel force by force, still less to use force in spreading the gospel. He is warning them by a memorable figure of changed circumstance for which they must now be prepared (v.[36]). Manson (*The Moffatt Commentary*) says of v.[35] that time was when the disciples could expect a welcome in their itineraries; purse and wallet were superfluous. That was no longer so. Of the word about the sword he advances two possible suggestions: (1) Jesus speaks literally but ironically, perhaps in reference to a smuggled weapon, 'Yes, provide yourselves with swords at whatever cost!' (2) He is speaking seriously but metaphorically. The sword is not literally intended. Either interpretation will suit v.[37], but the latter is favoured. He adds a third as sometimes offered. Jesus meant the sword to be taken literally and seriously to save the disciples from what might prove a murderous attack, but this conflicts with v.[38].

So much for the problem which, viewed in such light as the commentators bring to it, remains a problem still. Is there a solution? I venture to think that there is, though it has been so consistently missed—or rather, that there is a possible view of the narrative in which the latter ceases to be enigmatic. It is that which still remains open to us—the only one that does—after our rehearsal of judgments on the text, viz. that *we have here a passage without alien and contradictory elements—a straightforward narrative by Luke, condensed, as we may allow, but reproducing simply and accurately what happened and the words of Jesus uttered on the occasion.* With that hypothesis before us let us reconstruct the story.

It is essential to recall Jesus' assurance to His followers that they could absolutely depend upon their Heavenly Father's sustenance if they made the Kingdom their first quest (Mt 6[25-33]). This was fundamental in His teaching, and was re-emphasized by the directions given by Him when sending forth the Twelve and the Seventy on missions which would present the necessity, but provide also the test and the confirmation, of their faith (Mt 10[5. 9. 10], Mk 3[14], Lk 9[2. 3] 10[1]). Now the consummation of His ministry is near and His spirit is oppressed by sorrow and disappointment, caused largely by the lack of understanding on the part of His disciples making possible the treachery of Judas, the contentions of the rest about priority (v.[24]), and the presumption of Peter (vv.[31-34]). He had told them of the near crisis, and in view of the danger which menaced them (or Him) two of them had provided themselves with weapons.[1] There is no necessity to suppose that they were concealed though the narrative makes it probable, in which case Jesus' knowledge of the fact was intuitive (cf. Mk 2[8], Lk 9[47], Jn 1[48]). The saddening evidence was before Him of their defection of faith and He sought to bring it to their own realization, not by a direct charge but more kindly and more impressively by a reminder, which implied the question, 'Have you forgotten my lesson?' 'When I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, lacked ye anything?' 'Nothing,' they answer. 'But now'—to interpret further the implication of Jesus' question—'we are in a situation, you think, for which *God* is not sufficient and you must trust to yourselves? If that be so, and your safety, or mine, depends upon a *sword*, sell your cloak, if need be, and buy one.' Then follow words in closest relevance to His thought and of deepest import, signifying a situation *not* of God's failure but of the *consummation of His purpose*: 'For I say unto you that this that is written must yet be accomplished in me for the things concerning me have an end.' But the disciples concerned, still obtuse and dull of understanding, miss alike His words of gentle rebuke and irony and those of calm conviction and reassurance. Their only answer is, 'Lord, here are two swords.'[2] And Jesus simply uttered the brief and final word of sorrow, 'It is enough.' The time had run out, and there was no more to be said now. Thus read, the story—saving only that of the Crucifixion—is the most poignant in the New Testament.

---

[1] Possibly a Hebrew idiom (*vide* Dt 3[26]). There is also considerable agreement that v.[36] is a genuine *logion* of Jesus (so Schleiermacher, Bruce, Pfleiderer).

[2] Cf. Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*, p. 34 (Macmillan, 1907).

Can we read it otherwise? Not intelligibly, as I judge. In the interpretation above submitted the passage is no longer enigmatic. (1) It becomes a lucid recital, unified, coherent, self-consistent, in which every paragraph has its place as part of a harmonious whole, and thus gains in spiritual interest, significance, and value. But (2) it relieves the narrator of any charge of untrustworthiness. Did Luke understand the import of what happened any more than the disciples? If he did the reason for his inclusion of it in the Gospel is plain. If he did not[3] his fragment is of the greater apologetic worth. (3) It vindicates Jesus, exonerating Him from the appearance or charge of inconsistency in word or action as showing the misconstrued elements of the narrative to be singularly confirmatory, instead of contradictory, of Jesus' general teaching, and particularly of His injunction, 'Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you, and persecute you' (Mt 5[44]). With this the sequel and the conclusion of the story in vv.[49-51] is in accordance (cf. Mt 26[51. 52], Mk 14[47], Jn 18[10. 11]). For the fog which has invested the exegesis of the story from early times it is difficult to account.[4]

---

[1] Short, rather than long, swords.

[2] Prompted either by the consciousness that Jesus knows of their possession, or, more probably because, misunderstanding His reference to a sword, they feel that their action will have His approval.

[3] A possibility to be allowed for in view of the perplexity of modern interpreters in respect to it.

[4] Professor G. J. Heering, in his recent work, *The Fall of Christianity*, misses in this obscurity the strongest scriptural support for his general argument respecting the Church and War. He calls Lk 22[36-38] one of the dark passages of the N.T. (p. 24), and quotes the German theologian, Spitta, as saying of Jesus, 'It is enough': 'See! . . . *He* was no tender pacifist.'

Recent Foreign Theology.

PHILOLOGY, especially the philology of a Semitic language, is one of the most fascinating of all subjects of study, and the appearance of a serious Hebrew Grammar is an event worthy of particular note. The most recent contribution to the subject is a work by the distinguished French scholar, M. Mayer Lambert,[1] who has given us a volume even more bulky than that of Gesenius-Kautzsch. It treats in full of the sounds of the Hebrew language and of all the various forms appearing in the Bible, noting with meticulous accuracy even the accentuation of the Massoretic text. Complete paradigms are given, and M. Lambert has done his best to confine himself to forms which are actually found in the text.

---

[1] *Traité de Grammaire Hébraïque* (Librairie Ernest Leroux, Paris; 200 fr.).

In spite of this comprehensive treatment, we are left with the feeling that the work is still far from being complete. Only forty pages are devoted to Syntax, and Hebrew Syntax is a more complicated and elusive subject than some writers seem to believe. It is true that in dealing with a number of the forms M. Lambert has given also the use to which they were put, but this hardly compensates for the absence of a reasoned statement of the way in which the Hebrews put their ideas together. The delicate *nuance* which sometimes manifests itself in the choice of a particular form would often be missed by a student who had no other guide than this book; we have no mention of such usages as the 'Niphʿal tolerativum,' or of that curious employment of the Hithpaʿel to hint that the subject of the verb is playing a part. The precise shade of meaning involved in saying *hithmallekh*—'he behaved like an autocratic tyrant without any real justification'—instead of *malakh*—'he was, in fact, king'—is completely overlooked. The prepositions need a far fuller treatment (even Gesenius-Kautzsch is hardly adequate here), though it may well be argued that a proper handling of this subject would require a monograph of considerable size.

A real contribution to our understanding of Hebrew grammar, however, would go even further. All grammar is the resultant of two forces; the one is phonetic, the other psychological. We not infrequently find phenomena produced by similar phonetic tendencies in languages which have no historical connexion with one another; the treatment of the 'Beghadhkephath' letters in Hebrew is closely paralleled by the Celtic 'mutations.' Peculiarities springing from a psychological source, on the other hand, seldom find real (as distinct from apparent) similarities outside the group to which the language under discussion belongs. M. Lambert has not been invariably successful in appraising the influence of either factor in Hebrew, and, though he shows familiarity with the other chief languages of the Semitic family, he makes far less use of them than he might have done in the explanation of Hebrew forms. To take one small instance: in speaking of the formation of the plural in masculine nouns, he says (p. 89), 'La terminaison *îm* provient de *în*. . . .' This is hardly satisfactory. Both the M and the N are attempts to represent the nasalization of a final vowel, a phenomenon which appears also in the singular in Arabic and in the oldest known form of Akkadian. It is obviously due to that fact that at the end of a sound-group the vocal chords may continue to vibrate after the mouth has been shut. The masculine plural forms, in all groups of Semitic languages, are produced simply by drawling out this nasalized vowel and throwing the accent upon it. Of the three original cases the strictly accusative plural form has disappeared in all the groups, though its primitive existence may be conjectured, and Hebrew and Aramaic, unlike Akkadian and Arabic, have lost also the nominative. That this M or N is the result of such nasalization is clear from the fact that, as soon as the last syllable of the word ceases to be the end of the sound-group (*e.g.* in the construct or before suffixes), it disappears. There is, then, no ground for supposing that either of the two consonants, as full consonants, was original. Again, the psychological basis of the construct is ignored; it is due to the Semitic habit of contemplating the whole as an individual entity rather than as a combination of separate parts. The two nouns involved are not merely set side by side, as in Celtic languages (where they may be separated by an adjective), but, so to speak, telescoped into one another, thus forming a single new complex concept, comparable to the compound words so readily formed in Greek and German rather than to the connexion of two nouns through the genitive relation in Indo-European languages. When we turn to the verbs, we find that M. Lambert still retains the old terms 'passé' and 'futur' for the two finite verb-forms, though the analogy of Arabic, which requires an additional word or prefix to make the time-relation certain, should have taught us all that, whatever may have been the state of mind which prompted the choice of one form or the other, it was certainly not a desire to indicate the time-distinction. Let it be admitted that we have here a problem in Semitic psychology whose solution still eludes us; we should, nevertheless, have looked for some attempt at facing the questions raised by the facts of the accidence.

But, even if we cannot regard M. Lambert's work as a real discussion of Hebrew grammar, we cannot but pay our tribute of admiration for the thoroughness and completeness with which he has stated the facts and marshalled the forms. Earlier grammars may have given us most, if not all of them, but none has set them before the reader in so full and convenient a fashion, and the book may be of great value as a work of reference to which other students may turn in their efforts to grasp the secret of the Hebrew mind as expressed in its grammar.

T. H. Robinson.

Cardiff.

The Riddle of History and Christian Existence.

To those who wish to retain some divine sense in life, the events of history, and not least those of our own times, present a problem of deep urgency. It is a problem which touches life too closely to be easily set aside, and a problem of too great a magnitude to be solved by answers which look no farther than this present world. When death overtakes a man, and decay marks the end of nations or cultures, the this-worldly solution itself becomes a problem. But in the Gospel, Dr. Köberle has sought and found an answer to match the question.[1]

The divine sense in history is the return of man to God. On the basis of the Biblical view, history is seen as the working out of a conflict between Christ and Satan, between God and rebellious humanity. It is a conflict, however, in which the struggle is not equal, for in Christ God has struck the decisive blow; and if the battle still rages, yet faith knows that Satan's is a lost cause and it looks for the consummation. On this view, the meaning of history is vastly simplified and deepened: all events, whether of world-history or of personal life, have immediate reference to this ultimate conflict; they involve decision—for or against God. It is true that there is much in life to occasion doubt, not only of the sovereignty or goodness of God, but even of His existence. Dr. Köberle deals with some very relevant problems in relation to the divine government of the world—God's permission and judgment of evil, the sovereignty of God and the power of evil, God and the daily round, intercessory and petitionary prayer. The doctrine of Creation and Providence, he rightly insists, is to be understood not by 'Natural Theology,' but in the light of the second and third articles of the Creed. The rule of divine love is as hidden, save to the eye of faith, in history as in the humiliation of the Son of God. And yet we may await the consummation with confidence, and must learn to proclaim anew the Christian hope. We are not permitted to know when it will be, but we can in a measure read the signs of the times. Dr. Köberle's judgment is that 'the minute hand of the world's clock is moving perceptibly towards the twelfth hour. Whether the hour hand has already got so far . . . we do not know.'

The book shows perhaps traces of the apocalypticism, characteristic of much Continental theology to-day, which separates over sharply between this age and the age to come. It is also briefer at a number of points than might have been wished. Yet the grave perplexities of the modern situation are kept constantly in view, and in an easily readable, unacademic style the Christian answer is presented.

Dr. Hahn also writes[2] largely inspired by a practical problem, one with which every preacher and pastor must be faced. It is the question as to the relation between the historical event of the Cross and Resurrection of Christ and the actual life of the Christian to-day. To say that it is a relationship of faith is inadequate, for then the meaning of this 'faith' must be explained; and it can be explained in such a way as to rob the historical event of all real relevance. Paul, however, sets Christian existence in direct and immediate connexion with the Christ-event. His sayings about the death and resurrection of the Christian *with Christ* imply a real, personal participation of a person at a definite place and time in an historical event which happened at a definite place and time in the past. What this means is the subject of Dr. Hahn's investigation.

His thesis is, in brief, that the formula 'with Christ' signifies the 'contemporaneity' of the Christian with Christ. And this contemporaneity means neither the mystical ascent of the soul to union with Christ nor yet a static relation between the temporal and the supra-temporal worlds. It means that Christ, by a personal act comparable to the act of God in Creation makes one who is far removed from Him actually His contemporary. The possibility of this is to be found in the nature of the Incarnation. It is a real, historical event, but yet more than historical; it is a historical event which has absolute significance. It is the entry of the new *æon* into the present *æon*, of the eternal into time. As such it is sovereign over time, and can, so to speak, reach out and draw men into immediate relation to itself. This is accomplished by the Spirit and through certain definite means, namely, the preaching of the gospel, and the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. These, which are nothing in themselves, are to be regarded rather as 'functions of the Christ-event' through which the separation of space and time is overcome, and the Christian is brought into real and personal relation to Christ crucified and risen. Nothing of this, of course, is self-evident or demonstrable, but it takes place in faith. The Christian still lives in the flesh, though he has real fellowship with Christ; and faith looks forward, as the Christ-event points forward, to the Parousia. The Christian life is both a present possession and a future hope, both an indicative and an imperative, something given and something to be realized, both a dying and a rising with Christ.

---

[1] *Das Evangelium und die Rätsel der Geschichte*, von Adolf Köberle (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh, 1936; 2 RM.).

[2] *Das Mitsterben und Mitauferstehen mit Christus bei Paulus*, von Wilhelm Traugott Hahn (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh, 1937; 5 RM.).

This is a valuable contribution to the study of Pauline theology. Dr. Hahn makes a detailed and careful examination of the relevant passages, and takes account of the work of other interpreters with some very pertinent criticism. He insists that Paul must be interpreted in the light of Paul, and it is this he himself has sought to do. He takes as his starting-point the central theme of Paul's message—the crucified and risen Christ—and from this centre shows how much that is otherwise easily divorced from its context, falls into place. It is to be regretted that the book lacks an index.

Philip S. Watson.

Leeds.

* * *

The Swedish Church has during the last few decades produced many leaders, who have become widely known by their theological works or by the part they have played in œcumenical movements. But owing to the comparative isolation of the Scandinavian world, and perhaps also to the fact that the Swedish language is not widely read in other lands, some of the most influential leaders of its church life have not been known extensively outside its own borders. One of these, the subject of this work, Bishop Stadener, was a man of striking personality, a big man physically, intellectually, and spiritually, and he has left his mark deep on the life of his church in several departments of its activities. An excellent account of his life and work is given in this interesting volume.[1] It is a symposium, in which no less than twenty-nine writers give their reminiscences of him as they saw him in the different sides of his life and work. It thus lacks the unity of standpoint and style that would have been presented if it were the work of one biographer. But this is more than compensated for by the intimacy with which each side of his personality and work is set before us by a writer who came into close fellowship with him at different times and in different relations. His first ministerial appointment was that of pastor of the Swedish congregation in Paris, where he at once displayed the enterprise and strength of will that marked his whole career. He felt that the Church did not exist merely to enable the congregation to worship on Sunday, but should have premises that would put it in the position to be the centre of the whole social and religious life of the Swedish population of the French capital. His forceful character was shown in the way in which, in spite of great difficulties, he achieved his aim. In his next two pastorates, Malmö and Ystad, he developed great powers as a preacher, and attracted to his ministry many who had stood aloof from the Church and its services. One of the most interesting chapters in the book is that in which Ernst Newman analyses Stadener's power as a preacher. But he was not only a masterly pulpit orator, he was also a model pastor, a department of his work well described by A. Westin. The next stage in his career was his consecration as Bishop of Strängnäs, from which time he became one of the leading personalities of the Swedish Church. To the duties of this responsible office there and afterwards in Växjö he conscientiously devoted his great gifts, never sparing himself any toil in the discharge of them. His great influence in another direction was displayed when he became a Cabinet Minister in charge of ecclesiastical affairs. He came to this post at a critical point in the history of the relations of Church and State in Sweden, and was able to carry out arrangements advantageous to the Church. In theology he was a sturdy Lutheran Protestant and defended his views strenuously. But his interests were not merely in theological and ecclesiastical affairs. He earnestly cultivated his own spiritual life. His favourite study was the devotional literature of the Reformation period, the fruit of which is seen in two books of prayers which have become influential in the religious life of the Swedish Church. It is the opinion of one of the writers of this volume that history will look on him as one of the great bishops of Sweden.

* * *

A further indication of the widespread interest in the great Danish thinker is seen in this book[2] by Professor Franco Lombardi, who was impelled to write it by the absence of an adequate study of it in Italian and the complete absence of translations of Kierkegaard in that language. He depends mainly on German translations of Kierkegaard's works, which he justifies by the acknowledged faithfulness of most of these translations, and by the fact that Germany may be considered the second fatherland of Kierkegaard, because he drew his inspiration mainly from German movements of thought and exercised great influence on German thinkers. He bespeaks the indulgence of his readers on account of the toil involved in going through the labyrinth of Kierkegaard's works. Any one who has made a serious study of those works will sympathize with him in this. He begins his book with what must be one of the most complete bibliographies on the subject in existence, extending to twenty-two pages. The poverty of English work on the subject is seen in the fact that he gives the names of only two books in English—Dr. Allen's *Sören Kierkegaard: His Life and Thought*, and the reviewer's *Sören Kierkegaard: His Life and Religious Teaching*. Dr. Lowrie's biography had not appeared when he wrote. Among the articles he has overlooked the excellent one in Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. He adds about eighty pages of translated extracts. In discussing the teaching of Kierkegaard he endeavours to fit it into the framework of German philosophical thought, especially in its relation to and its reaction against Hegel. He properly lays great stress on the dominating position sin occupies in Kierkegaard's thought, and in this he recognizes him as the elder brother of Ibsen and Strindberg, two influential Scandinavian writers whose thinking was largely shaped by Kierkegaard. This was probably more than anything else the root of his relentless opposition to Hegel's philosophy. Anything that tended to minimize the sense of appalling tragedy of sin in human life and history Kierkegaard opposed with all the earnestness of which he was capable. In this he rendered valuable service to religion at a time when the tendency was to underestimate its influence. By insisting that sin must not be left out of account in any estimate of the meaning of human life Kierkegaard put his finger on the most serious defect in most philosophical systems. Indeed, he considers that sin puts all philosophies out of court, because they cannot fit it into their schemes. In this connexion Kierkegaard enhances the importance of personality, and has done much to put personality into the position it occupies in modern thinking. This and the other aspects of Kierkegaard's work are brought out well in Professor Lombardi's book. Readers of Italian will find in this book an excellent statement of the religious and philosophical teaching of Kierkegaard.

---

[1] *Sam. Stadener: Mannen och gärningen* (C. W. K. Gleerups Förlag, Lund).

[2] *Kierkegaard* (La Nuova Italia, Florence).

John A. Bain.

Belfast.

Contributions and Comments.

Romans viii. 28.

Recent commentaries on *Romans* unite in rejecting the A.V. and R.V. translations of 8^{28}. Οἴδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν Θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθὸν . . . (AB, Orig. add ὅ Θεός after συνεργεῖ; cf. Boh., Sah., Aeth.) (R.V. And we know that to them that love God all things work together for good.) The translation most widely accepted now is, 'With them that love Him God co-operates in everything for good.' This is, for example, the view of Professor C. H. Dodd in the *Moffatt Commentary* (London, 1932, p. 137). Lagrange, however, in his recent commentary (Paris, 1931, p. 213) follows Sanday-Headlam in giving a transitive meaning to the verb: 'Or nous savons que Dieu fait tout concourir au bien de ceux qui l'aiment.' A fourth translation seems possible: 'Everything works together for good with them that love God.' In the present note, the variant reading has been ignored, and an attempt has been made to approach the verse from the purely philological point of view. The writer has examined seventy-three passages, in the Greek of various periods, in which the verb συνεργῶ occurs. More than half of these passages were not found to be cited in Moulton and Milligan, Preisigke, and Liddell and Scott (revised, 1936). It will be seen that the fourth translation is better attested from the point of view of actual usage.

There can be no objection to the old translation on the ground that συνεργῶ needs a personal subject. A neuter substantive or adjective is frequently the subject, and it is much more frequently followed by the preposition εἰς or πρός when the subject is neuter than when it is personal, *e.g.* Aristotle, *Magna Moralia*, 1185*a*, 35, ὥς οὐδεν συνεργεῖ τὸ μόριον τοῦτο πρὸς τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν. 'So that this part in no wise co-operates towards happiness.' Theophrastus, *De Odoribus*, 32, Συνεργεῖν δὲ δοκοῦσι πρὸς τὰς γεύσαις οὐχ αἱ ὀδμαὶ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ δριμύτητες. . . . 'It is not only smell which appears helpful for taste, but also pungency. . . .' Id., *Metaphysica*, 2, ὥσπερ ἑκάτερα κεχωρισμένα συνεργοῦντα δέ πως εἰς τὴν πᾶσαν οὐσίαν, '. . . as though all the elements were separated but were contributing somehow to the whole being.' Id., *De Causis Plantarum*, iv. 8. 3, πάντα δὲ ταῦτα συνεργεῖ καὶ πρὸς πλῆθος καρποῦ καὶ πρὸς κουφότητα τῆς γῆς. . . . 'All these things contribute both to the quantity of the fruit and to the lightness of the soil. . . .' This clear usage of the verb with a neuter subject and with the meaning 'co-operate towards,' 'contribute to' is apparently the one recognized in the A.V. and R.V. translations of the sentence under discussion, except that a 'Dative of Interest or Advantage' precedes the usage. Syntactically that would not be impossible, but it would not be good Greek in view of the ambiguity arising through the use of a verb which may take another and nearer dative. No parallel example of such a syntax has been found with συνεργῶ, and Professor C. H. Dodd indeed claims that 'the familiar translation is not an admissible rendering of the Greek' (*loc. cit.*).

However, as far as the actual examples go, his own translation has to face a somewhat similar objection. There are some examples, though late, of the construction συνεργεῖν τινι εἴς τι, *e.g.* M. Antonius, vi. 14. 2, ὁ δὲ ψυχὴν . . . τιμῶν . . . τῷ ὁμογενεῖ εἰς τοῦτο συνεργεῖ. 'He who honours . . . the soul co-operates with his like towards this end.' Id., ix. 40. 3, πάντως γάρ, εἰ δύνανται συνεργεῖν ἀνθρώποις, καὶ εἰς ταῦτα δύνανται συνεργεῖν. 'Certainly, if they (the gods) are able to co-operate with men, they are able to co-operate even in these matters.' *Inscriptiones Græcæ*, 2^2, 654. 15, συνεργεῖν εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῇ πόλει. 'Co-operate with the city for its freedom'; cf. *Test. xii. Patr.*, *Issach.* 3 and *Gad* 4 (quoted in Sanday-Headlam and other commentaries; Sanday-Headlam strangely take them as examples of the transitive use of the verb, although the verb does not govern an accusative in either of them). It is the presence of the word πάντα in Ro 8^{28} which gives the construction a complexity not paralleled in the usages observed. It is feasible to explain πάντα as an 'Inner Accusative'—'in respect of everything,' and in sentences where the syntax is simpler such an accusative is found with συνεργῶ (see below). Not a single instance can be cited, however, for the construction συνεργεῖν τι τινι εἴς τι. Moffatt's translation should not be described, perhaps, as an 'inadmissible rendering of the Greek'; the corresponding Greek construction simply doesn't happen to occur.

It was apparently the difficulty in dealing with this accusative which prompted Sanday-Headlam to think that the verb may here be transitive, with the meaning 'cause to work together.' A. Pallis (*To the Romans*, Liverpool, 1920, p. 107) takes πάντα adverbially, 'always,' 'ever,' for which he adduces some parallel examples, though not with this verb. The idea that συνεργῶ is here transitive has gained considerable support. J. H. Moulton in his *Grammar of N.T. Greek* (p. 65), Lagrange in his commentary (*loc. cit.*), and Milligan in his *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, vii. p. 605, are all in favour of it. Lagrange quotes Xen. *Memor.* iii. 5. 16, ἀντὶ μὲν τοῦ συνεργεῖν ἑαυτοῖς τὰ συμφέροντα. 'Instead of contributing fitting services to one another.' He also compares Heliodorus, ix. 11. . . . τὸν δρασμὸν τοῖς Πέρσαις συνεργήσαντες . . . 'having facilitated the flight for the Persians.' Milligan, while supporting the idea, does not quote examples in support of it from the non-literary sources. The following quotations may favour this explanation: Polybius, xi. 9. 1, ἔφη . . . πόλλα συνεργεῖν τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἐπισκευῆς ἁρμογὴν τῶν ὅπλων εἰς τὴν χρείαν, 'He said . . . that the fitting up of arms from the prepared store contributed a great deal to their advantage.' Aristotle, *M. M.*, 1185*a*, 35 (quoted above). Philodemus, Περὶ Κακίων. 12, [ὥστε] μικρὸν ἔρ[γ]ον [συν]εργῶν, '. . . so that contributing a small deed. . . .' *Orientis Græci Inscriptiones Selectæ*, Dittenberger, 45. 10. 11, πολλὰ συνήργησε τοῖς Ἰτανίοις, 'He provided the Itanians with many things.' The latter example, together with one like *P. Lond*, 358. 6, τῶν δεῖνα συνεργούντων ἀλλήλοις, 'who help one another in distress' (cf. Wessely *Studien, etc.*, xxii. 184. 47—γοῦντος αὐτῳ τοῦ δεῖνα), suggests that the accusative may not be the direct object of the verb, but an 'Inner Accusative' after an intransitive. All the examples quoted in the present paragraph can be similarly explained.

A final possibility, which has been ignored by commentators, is that the construction is πάντα συνεργεῖ τινι εἴς τι, 'All things work together with some one for something.' It has been shown above that συνεργῶ frequently has a neuter subject and is followed by εἴς or πρός. The examples now to be quoted use a dative also in the same construction, so that the syntax is exactly parallel to the one suggested in the present case. Theophrastus, *De Causis Plantarum*, iii. 1. 1, Ἡ περὶ τῶν φυτῶν θεωρία διττας ἔχει τὰς σκέψεις καὶ ἐν δυσὶ, μίαν μὲν τὴν ἐν τοῖς αὐτομάτοις γινομένην ἥπερ ἀρχὴ τῆς φύσεως, ἑτέραν δὲ τῶν ἐκ τῆς ἐπινοίας καὶ παρασκευῆς ἣν δή φαμεν συνεργεῖν τῇ φύσει πρὸς τὸ τέλος, 'The study of plants holds a double view, and in two spheres, one of them arising from the self-impelled things, which is the origin of Nature, the other belonging to the forethought and design which we say works with Nature for the end.' Polybius, iii. 97. 5, καὶ ταὐτομάτου συνεργήσαντος σφίσι πρὸς τοὺς περιεστῶτας καιρούς, 'The event itself co-operating with them in face of the existing difficulties.' It is this construction, with πάντα as subject—and not a personal subject—though with another verb and without πρός, that is echoed in a subsequent imitator. *Orac. Sib.* 3. 649, πάντα γὰρ αὐτοῖς συναγωνιᾷ, οὐρανὸς ἠέλιός τε, 'For all things are sharing with them in their struggle, heaven and sun.' J. Gwyn Griffiths.

Pentre, Rhondda, Wales.

Luke xvii. 21:

ἰδοὺ γάρ, ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν.

The opinion that ἐντός can mean 'among,' 'in the midst of,' has recently been revived by Mr. Conrad Noel in *The Life of Jesus* (see p. 439, note 1, where he speaks of 'the fact that the word ἐντός is used as equivalent to "among" by Plato, Xenophon, and Thucydides'). But the evidence for ἐντός = 'among' is very precarious.

1. Liddell and Scott (new edition) offer no example of ἐντός in this sense.

2. The passages commonly cited as parallels for ἐντός = 'among' are not to the point, except in one doubtful case. The passages are Xen. *Anab.* 1. 10. 3 and *Hell.* 2. 3. 19. These are cited in many of the commentaries on Luke, for example, in those of B. Weiss, Plummer, and Creed; by Grimm in his Lexicon (though Thayer adds, 'But see the passage,' in reference to *Anab.* 1. 10. 3); and by Bauer in his *Wörterbuch.* Plummer adds Plato, *Laws* 789 A. The last, a reference to children still in their mothers' wombs, τοῖς ἐντὸς τῶν αὐτῶν μητέρων τρεφομένοις, is an admirable example of the normal use of ἐντός = 'inside,' 'within,' and need not be considered further.

Xen. *Hell.* 2. 3. 19. Theramenes, arguing against the appointment of the Three Thousand, says he thinks it absurd to choose exactly three thousand men, ὥσπερ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦτον ἔχοντά τινα ἀνάγκην καλοὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς εἶναι, καὶ οὐκ ἔξω τούτων σπουδαίους οὔτ᾽ ἐντὸς τούτων πονηροὺς οἷόν τε εἴη γενέσθαι. Here, since a verbal antithesis is plainly intended, it is unreasonable to interpret ἐντὸς τούτων except in connexion with ἔξω τούτων. If, then, ἔξω τούτων means (as it obviously does) 'outside that number,' ἐντὸς τούτων means 'inside that number,' that is, within it. So G. M. Edwards, who, in his note on the passage, translates: '. . . as if that number carried with it the necessity that those selected should be good men and true, and as if there could be no respectable persons outside and no scoundrels inside this charmed circle.'

Xen. *Anab.* 1. 10. 3. (The Greek soldiers resist an attack and save a concubine of Cyrus who has escaped to them) . . . οὐ μὴν ἔφογόν γε, ἀλλὰ καὶ ταύτην ἔσωσαν καὶ τἆλλα ὁπόσα ἐντὸς αὐτῶν καὶ χρήματα καὶ ἄνθρωποι ἐγένοντο πάντα ἔσωσαν. Here the rendering 'amongst them' has at least a measure of plausibility. Field, however (*Notes on the Translation of the N.T.*^{2}, p. 71) pointed out that in this passage ἐντὸς αὐτῶν is not simply 'among them' but '*within their position*': and he is followed in this interpretation by Liddell and Scott, new edition ('within their own lines'). This use of ἐντός, as Field noted, is not different from its use in other examples: for example (from those given by Liddell and Scott, new ed.), τειχέος ἐντὸς ἰόντες, Hom. *Il.* 12. 374: ἐντὸς λίαν τῶν τειχῶν (too much within the walls), Thuc. 7. 5. 3: τοὺς σκευοφόρους ἐντὸς τούτων τῶν ἐπιτάκτων ἐποιήσαντο (camp-followers placed inside a reserve of troops), Thuc. 6. 67. 1. Since (as far as I am aware) no other example of ἐντός = 'among' has yet been adduced, it seems wiser to follow Field and Liddell and Scott, new ed., in their interpretation of ἐντός in *Anab.* 1. 10. 3, than to suppose that here, and here only in extant Greek literature, does ἐντός = 'among.'

3. No decisive evidence for the use of ἐντός is forthcoming from the Papyri, according to Moulton and Milligan, *VGT*, s.v. ἐντός. The parallel to Lk 17^{21} from the New Sayings of Jesus, Pap. Oxy. iv. 654^{16}, which they quote, is too mutilated to show whether ἐντός is there used in any other than its normal sense. Bauer (*op. cit.* published last year) has nothing further to add from the Papyri.

I conclude, therefore, that if, on general grounds, ἐντὸς ὑμῶν in Lk 17^{21} be rendered 'in your midst,' rather than 'in your hearts,' this rendering is a violation of the known usage of the word ἐντός. Into the difficult question of the grounds which have led many scholars to adopt the rendering 'in your midst,' I do not venture to enter. But the following points are possibly worth consideration:—

1. The Aramaic word which our Lord used may, no doubt, have borne either meaning. But (i) we are dealing not with what our Lord might have said, but with what Luke wrote; (ii) If Luke had wished to preserve the ambiguity of the Aramaic

he could have used an ambiguous word in the Greek, for example, ἐν: if he had wished to say 'in your midst' it is difficult to see why he should not have said ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν, as in 22[27].

2. The difficulty about our Lord's saying 'The Kingdom is in your hearts' when He was addressing His opponents the Pharisees, disappears if ὑμῶν is taken impersonally, as often in our Lord's teaching. Thus Otto, in *The Kingdom of Heaven and the Son of Man*, p. 135: "You" here [Lk 17[21]] means neither the Pharisees in particular, nor the scribes, but the same "you" as are generally addressed by Jesus. . . . "To you" is a stereotyped phrase employed whenever anything is said about the coming kingdom.'

P. M. S. Allen.

Worcester College, Oxford.

Entre Nous.

A Religious Pilgrimage.

This is the sub-title which the Rev. T. Rhondda Williams, D.D., has given to his autobiography—*How I Found My Faith* (Cassell; 10s. 6d. net), and it is in the account of his spiritual development that the great interest of the book lies.

But from the beginning Dr. Williams's story is full of romance. His father was a man of varied fortunes in various places, but wherever he was, and whether in or out of employment, he did not cease his work as an itinerant Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Preacher. Dr. Williams was one of eighteen children, and at the age of nine went into the coal pit. He worked, he tells us, in a bending position, for the seam was only three feet high; but 'My life in the mine was not unhappy, although in winter I never saw daylight except on Saturday afternoon and Sunday, and was usually so tired when I got home that I had to lie on the stone floor of the living-room for an hour before I could even wash or eat.' There ran alongside his work-life a life created by religious influences—the Sunday School and Band of Hope.

'If I cut out my interest in religious things I cut out by far the brightest and happiest part of my childhood.' At fourteen we find him beginning to preach. 'It was absurd,' he says looking back on it.

After a time at Cardiff Grammar School, to which he was able to go through the kindness of neighbours who had a benefit concert for him, he spent some years at Carmarthen College. At the age of twenty he entered the Ministry of the Welsh Congregational Church and went to Dowlais. After that he was in Neath, and after a few more years he found himself chosen to minister to the important Greenfield Church at Bradford.

Here it was that he found himself for the first time confronted with theological difficulties. 'There were men in our Minister's Fraternal who spoke of things Biblical and theological in a way that left me in utter darkness as to what they meant, except that I saw that it meant something entirely different from what I believed.' He was brought face to face for the first time with the results of Higher Criticism: 'My old theory of the Bible simply went to pieces upon indisputable evidence, and not to give it up would mean being a traitor to discovered facts.' The one point all through that he was determined about was that he must be, from beginning to end, honest: 'I had first to find a faith which I could hold sincerely without playing tricks with my own soul, for I had made up my mind that I would have an honest faith or none at all. . . . This still seems to me to be the right starting-point if a man is to do anything worth while for others; he must not compromise the integrity of his own faith.'

There came presently the glorious day when he again felt sure of his faith: 'He brought me up out of a horrible pit, out of a miry clay and he set my feet upon a rock and established my going.'

Dr. Williams does not stress the work that he did himself in popularizing the modern attitude to the Bible, but he does tell with pleasure that Dr. Fosdick said of him: 'You have been one of the formative influences in my life.'

On several occasions there has come to Dr. Williams a special experience: 'I do not pretend to know what this experience was, nor exactly how to evaluate it, though I know it made a valuable difference' . . . 'it was as if the Divine Immanence, which I had believed in as a rational doctrine had become suddenly an overwhelming and triumphant experience. I find parallels to it in the Mystics, in Jacob Boehme, in William Law.'

It came to him once: 'while staying at Enfield with the Rev. R. J. Campbell, as I walked alone in the garden early one lovely morning, when the natural light seemed shot through with some other light.

'Another time when a great trouble was filling me with apprehension I was walking along one of those streets in Manningham, where not a blade of grass is to be seen. Suddenly there shone round me what felt like a physical light, but which I knew was not, and a voice in me said : " Be at peace ; all will be right." And so it was.

'A third occasion was on the Downs near Brighton, during the war, on a glorious spring day. Oppressed by the terrible war happenings, there broke over me once again a feeling of overwhelming love and goodness and peace as the eternal things in life. For the moment all the horror and evil seemed swallowed up in infinite good. The ocean of light, as George Fox said, flowed over the ocean of darkness and death.'

We must make a good life of it.

An account of the life of *Edith Davidson of Lambeth* has been written by M. C. S. M., one who was in the closest touch with Mrs. Davidson for many years (John Murray ; 9s. net).

The first question that occurs to one to ask is whether there was room for this biography after the very full one of Archbishop Davidson by the Bishop of Chichester, but of necessity that occupied itself with the public life rather than the private life of Archbishop Davidson, and this is essentially a story of home life. There are a number of revealing anedcotes.

'An unsatisfactory employee was being discussed at breakfast one day, years ago—one who was weak in character and had failed again and again ; dismissal was suggested. The Archbishop was present, reading *The Times*. He suddenly dropped the paper and Mrs. Davidson said : " Well, Randall, what are you thinking about ? " He replied : " Oh—only when you were all talking about poor so-and-so, I was saying to myself the words that were said over me at my consecration—'Hold up the weak, heal the sick, bind up the broken, bring again the outcasts, seek the lost.' " And he got up and left the room. Mrs. Davidson gathered up her letters from the breakfast-table and said : " While we were talking, Randall was praying for ——. He will have another chance." '

The volume is not at all a large one but within its scope it does two things well. It gives a charming picture of the leisurely life of earlier days when telephones and motor-cars were unknown and rooms were lit by candlelight. A journey abroad paid under the personal supervision of Mr. Cooke who acts as courier is amusingly described.

'My surprise was great when a quiet, middle-aged man, very much like a home-staying retired tradesman, was pointed out to me, walking up and down the platform with his hands in his pockets seemingly taking notice of no one. He could not speak a word of any language but his own ! . . .'

The second thing which this volume does so well is to make us feel the strong religious background of Mrs. Davidson's early homes, and realize what it was that she carried with her to the homes of her married life.

'I want to gather myself and live well this summer—so help me God. It won't be easy—but I'll try—so as to make what I can of Randall's wife.'

A recurrent phrase is 'we must make a good life of it.'

The Importance of Preaching.

The Dean of Winchester has just published a volume of Sermons with the title *The White Horseman* (S.P.C.K. ; 5s. net). Dr. Selwyn has prefaced his volume by a valuable chapter 'Concerning Sermons.'

He begins by quoting Rose Macaulay's ironical remark : 'though, of course there is, from time to time a sermon. . . . But it seems that this cannot, in any Church, be helped.' Dr. Selwyn believes that the preacher's task is one of great value, for he is here to answer the most important of all questions. Mr. Aldous Huxley's 'Ends and Means' he says is 'a kind of preacher's *apologia*.'

'" Technological advance is rapid, but without progress in charity, technological advance is useless. Indeed, it . . . has merely provided us with more efficient means for going backwards." And he insists that our metaphysical beliefs, which give us our ends in life, are the crux of the whole matter. " What sort of world is this, in which men aspire to good, and yet so frequently achieve evil ? What is the sense and point of the whole affair ? What is man's place in it, and how are his ideals, his systems of values, related to the universe at large ? " These are just the questions which the preacher is there to answer ? '

The ministry of vision is as much as ever a vital principal of social health, and in that field the minister of the Word of God has a great part to play.

By the sermon Dr. Selwyn argues, the Church shows the 'Vision of Human Life,' illuminates all man's most important relationships and the several obligations of each, setting them all against the background of man as a spiritual creature.

The sermons are arranged in groups and deal with the seasons and with particular occasions as well as with more general subjects. The title of the volume is taken from the last Sermon—The White Horseman being the Horseman in the nineteenth chapter of Revelation. We have quoted it, in shortened form, in 'The Christian Year' this month, so enabling our readers to judge for themselves the quality of the volume.

'Treated like a real Lady.'

'More than a month afterwards one of the old ladies from the workhouse who had been one of our guests, climbed the stairs of Somerset Terrace and asked for Mary Neal. Tempted perhaps by the desire to keep a memento of the day, she had concealed a spoon in her stocking and had taken it back to the workhouse. (It was only a caterer's spoon, and of no value whatever.) She was overcome afterwards by the thought that after being treated "just as though I was a real lady" she had taken the spoon. She suffered a fortnight's remorse, and on her next day out she had tramped to Canning Town to find some one to whom she could restore it. Baffled in her search she had walked all those miles back to the Marylebone workhouse to suffer another fortnight of mental misery. When again the day's freedom was due to her, she trudged to Somerset Terrace where she found Mary Neal, and with tears of contrition returned the spoon!

'"Treated like a real lady" — that fact it was that had pierced her poor old heart.'[1]

Too Old.

Some little time ago we published a children's address by the Reverend John T. Taylor. Readers of it will be glad to have *One-Man Band*, a volume of forty talks to young people, published by Messrs. Allenson at 3s. 6d. net. We quote a part of 'The Crocus that missed the Bus.'

'You will know, of course, that you can find other things in the garden besides flowers. Just think of the things which you have actually found there—and lost there, if it comes to that.

'The particular thing that I found in my garden one day gave me a shock. No, they were not worms! . . . My shock was to find in a paper bag twelve crocus bulbs (I suppose I ought to call them "corms") which had missed the bus. You will remember that the crocus blooms in the spring—in the month of March. You will have noticed how badly the sparrows treat them in the park. To me, spring would hardly be spring without their blue, white, and golden flowers.

'Well, as I have said, there were the bulbs, and it was early summer. Not only had the time for planting gone by, but the time for flowering as well. They were too late for that year certainly, and perhaps too late for ALWAYS. . . . That is why my finding them gave me such a shock.

'Too late to Flower! It is bad enough to be too late for the shop when you have been sent to buy something; it is bad enough to miss the train; it is simply dreadful to arrive at the Post Office, and to find that you cannot get a postal order; and it must be AWFUL to be late for business—but how much more dreadful must it be to be too late for things which can never, never, never come back again to us.

'If you should be unlucky enough to get to the railway station too late for the school excursion, you just miss your treat for that year, but if you miss the time for the scholarship exam. you have missed that FOR THE WHOLE OF YOUR LIFE. The chance does not often come again. Like the crocuses, you have missed the bus very badly.

'I do not think you can ever be too old to study, but you know youth is the flowering time for that. Make the best and the most of it. I would like also to think that people can never be too old to break off bad habits, but boyhood and girlhood is the finest time for this special flowering. And I rejoice that we can never be too far on in years to give ourselves to the Lord Jesus, but after all it is best to do that while we are young.

'I am more sorry than I can say for my crocuses, but I am more sorry still for some people who know they are past their flowering time.'

New Poetry.

Two Anthologies of poetry have been published by Messrs. Macmillan. The smaller volume, *Poems of To-Day* (3s. 6d. net), has been compiled by the English Association, and forms the third series of their collection. It consists of poems published since 1922 down to the present day. This is a selection which we feel should on no account be missed. It is excellent in every way, carrying out fully the selectors' purpose of including poems that are truly typical of the modern school while yet conforming to certain accepted canons of style. A useful feature is the short biographical notes.

The second Anthology is somewhat larger (6s. net) and the title is *Poems of Twenty Years*. It has been compiled by Mr. Maurice Wollman who was for some years editor of 'Modern Poetry.' He is a fine judge of poetry, and in spite of some omissions and some curious inclusions also—we wonder why Mr. George Barker's Juvenilia rather than more truly representative poems, have been chosen—we would say you must get this volume also.

---

[1] Emmeline Pethick-Lawrence, *My Part in a Changing World*, 125.

There are very few poems common to both volumes, though as would be expected since the period covered is very similar, many of the same authors appear. The only case that we have noticed where there are several repetitions is in that of Mr. Day Lewis, who, by the bye, appears in the one volume under 'Day' and in the other under 'Lewis.' We have quoted one of his poems (from *Poems of To-Day*). Mr. Wollman in his interesting introduction says of Mr. Day Lewis's poetry that 'the basis of it is "man's inhumanity to man" and, offshoot of the War, the essential and eternal brotherhood of man.'

From *Poems of Twenty Years* we quote one of Mr. James Stephens, and a short poem by Sylvia Lynd.

Oh Hush Thee, My Baby

Oh hush thee, my baby,
Thy cradle's in pawn:
No blankets to cover thee
Cold and forlorn.
The stars in the bright sky
Look down and are dumb
At the heir of the ages
Asleep in a slum.

The hooters are blowing,
No heed let him take;
When baby is hungry
'Tis best not to wake.
Thy mother is crying,
Thy dad's on the dole:
Two shillings a week is
The price of a soul.

Cecil Day Lewis.

The Moon Hath Not.

The moon hath not got any light;
All that beauty, all that power,
Is a cheat upon the sight,
Is come and gone within the hour!
What is pure,
Or what is lovely?
Nothing is that will endure!

An apple-blossom in the spring,
When spring awakens everything,
Is pure or lovely as it please,
Or not as it knows not of these!
What is pure,
Or what is lovely?
Nothing is that will endure!

Pure is cherished in a dream,
Loveliness in little thought;
Out of nowhere do they gleam,
Out of nothing are they wrought!
What is pure
Or what is lovely?
Nothing is that will endure!

Courage, goodness, tenderness:
Beauty, wisdom, ecstasy:
Wonder, love, and loveliness:
Hope, and immortality:
What is pure,
Or what is lovely?
Nothing is that will endure!

Pure and lovely sleep and wait,
Where not good nor ill is done,
In the keep, within the gate,
At the heart of everyone:
What is pure,
Or what is lovely?
All is, and doth all endure.

James Stephens.

The Enemies.

Time, change and death, these
Three are Man's enemies.

What? Time that takes the pain from grief,
That brings again bud and leaf,
That sets the child in its mother's arms?

What? Change that gives eyes to the blind,
That in decay can freshness find,
Making old, new; familiar, strange?

What? Death that shuts the gate
On longing and regret,
Grief, fear, pain, shame, satiety, and all harms—
Time and change?

Sylvia Lynd.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

The prominence given to symbolism in religion has caused religious truth to be looked upon with suspicion by many. It is felt to be less dependable, less firmly grounded in reality than the well-established truths of science.

This whole subject, which is one of great importance, is finely treated in *Symbolism and Belief*, by Dr. Edwyn Bevan (Allen & Unwin; 15s. net). This book contains the Gifford Lectures delivered in Edinburgh in 1933–34, and it merits, and will doubtless receive, the most careful attention from students of the subject. It is marked by profound insight, ripe thought, and a rare maturity of judgment. It is impossible in these notes to give any adequate idea of its wealth in historical and exegetical criticism, in philosophic and scientific argumentation, and in constructive religious thinking.

One point touched upon, but perhaps not sufficiently emphasized, is that physical science is as full of symbolism as religious thought. Max Planck, the greatest of scientists, says that the difference between the physical reality and the scientific representation of it is as great as the difference between a cow and the picture of a cow. 'Directly observable quantities do not appear at all in the world picture. It contains nothing but symbols.'

Accordingly the youthful preacher who tries to startle his people by announcing that the language of the Apocalypse is nothing but symbol, as if that were specially true of that particular book, is not saying anything very enlightening or helpful. As a matter of fact there is no more symbolism in St. John's vision of the New Jerusalem than there is in Bohr's picture of the atom or Einstein's theory of relativity. They are all endeavouring, each in his own way, to picture the unpicturable.

From the days of the great Greek thinkers men have felt the difficulty of expressing in any worthy way their thoughts about God and the spiritual world, and they have been compelled to use imagery which may be called anthropomorphic. They have done this with quite open eyes because no other course was possible. It shows culpable ignorance, therefore, of the history of religious thought to suppose, as Julian Huxley and others do, that 'it is only very modern, relatively enlightened, thinkers in the Christian Church who are at last beginning to shed the traditional anthropomorphism.'

Plato knew perfectly well what he was doing when he put his highest truths in the form of myths, and Plotinus clearly indicates his own procedure. 'Since no phrase you can use about the Supreme is adequate to the Reality, all you can do is to throw out your phrase at It and then deny that the phrase is true. This leaves a kind of impression or idea in the hearer's mind, but at the same time prevents him from committing himself to it too fast and fixedly.'

Vol. XLIX.—No. 11.—August 1938.

The impossibility of getting rid of symbolism may be illustrated by reference to all the words denoting 'height' which are applied to God and to His home in heaven above and to all things that have value. To this topic Dr. Bevan has devoted two fascinating lectures. In speaking of the Most High God who dwells in heaven above there seems to be a focussing in one compound feeling of different aspects and implications of spacial height. There is the feeling of power as in a blow coming from above or in a man standing over another who is prostrate on the ground. There is the wider range of vision which elevation gives, and the consequent power to guide and command. There is also the feeling that to climb upwards is hard and the sky is an unattainable altitude. All these complex thoughts and feelings find appropriate expression in words indicative of spacial height, and they are not in the slightest degree affected, as some foolishly suppose, by Copernican astronomy or any scientific theory. They are inescapable. If we try to express ourselves in more abstract and philosophic language and speak of the 'transcendence' of God and the 'sublimity' of things divine, we discover that we are merely using Latin words expressive of spacial height.

The question may be raised as to what type of symbols it is best to use, whether the plain and homely symbols derived from material things and the experiences of daily life or the more abstract ideas of the philosopher, which, it should always be remembered, are just as full of symbolism as the former.

In this connexion the words of a French writer, Jean Guitton, may be quoted: 'Now since man cannot any way escape from the snares of metaphor, is it not well to have recourse to the homelier metaphors? Mythical imagery, used by a thinker who can subordinate it to his purpose, has in this respect an advantage. In the first place it can furnish instruction, telling and explicit, for the common man. And is there any real danger of its leading the wise man astray? The crying disproportion between the image and the reality it represents warns him that the words are only expedients and makeshifts. Their very poverty helps him to realize that God is beyond every possible conception, every possible image.' But if more subtle language is used, and imagery derived from the working of the human mind, there is an insidious danger lest such language should be taken as more than symbolic, as adequate to the reality to be expressed. 'We shall never surmount the limits by which nature has circumscribed us. But while the mental anthropomorphism in assimilating the Divine mode of working to the measure of the human spirit is liable to lead astray, the material anthropomorphism is its own safeguard against its miserable inadequacy.'

Dean Mansel similarly animadverted on 'that morbid horror of what they are pleased to call anthropomorphism, which poisons the speculations of so many modern philosophers.' He pointed out that all speech about God is symbolic, and held that it was a mistake to suppose you could get to anything more literally true than the anthropomorphic imagery. 'We dishonour God far more by identifying Him with the feeble and negative impotence of thought which we are pleased to style the Infinite than by remaining content with those limits which He for His own good purposes has imposed upon us.' This preference for anthropomorphic imagery, then, is not the *naïveté* of the man who has never perceived its philosophical inadequacy, but the result of a scepticism pushed far enough to feel the inadequacy of all philosophical formulas offered as a substitute.

'We can see how, if Mansel is right, rational argument about God or the presentation of God's action in the documents of religion may be completely fallacious. Not because the Reality is itself irrational; we may believe that, if God and the actions of God could be known to finite minds, they would exhibit reason in its ultimate perfection, and yet believe that reasonings about God and His actions are fallacious. If all our notions of God are merely images which stand for an inconceivable Reality—counters, as it were, which more or less misrepresent that Reality—our reasonings are no more than the manipulation of such counters, and the result we arrive at may be remote from the truth. We may have conducted the process of reasoning with flawless consistency all through, but we are operating all the time only with counters, not with the realities themselves.'

To this view of Mansel's Dr. BEVAN inclines to give general assent. It is a commonplace in theology that all our conceptions of God are utterly inadequate to the Reality, all our representations are only figures by which we strive to indicate the unimaginable. 'If this is so, Mansel is reasonable in contending that anthropomorphic imagery may give us the essence of the Reality better than an abstract metaphysical formula which will be just as much beset by the limitations of the human mind and may deceive by its pretence of superior knowledge.'

It would seem to follow from this that religious certitude comes not by processes of logical argumentation but rather is grounded and confirmed in practical experience. 'While our best conceptions of God remain symbols of a Reality we cannot imagine, it is because these conceptions, when acted on, produce a life of a certain quality, as compared with other conceptions of the universe, that the man who believes in God gains assurance that he does right in believing.'

This looks very like Pragmatism, but in reality it differs from the Pragmatic view in respect of the fact that religious faith bases itself upon a Reality which is believed to exist in absolute independence. 'Take the conception of God as a loving Father. Obviously such an idea of God is symbolic. But the Theist or Christian does not merely say, "Act as if there were a God who is a loving Father, and you will find certain desirable results follow" (that is Pragmatism): he says, "Act as if there were God who is a loving Father, and you will, in so doing, be making the right response to that which God really is." God is really of such a character that, if any of us could know Him as He is (which we cannot do) and then had to describe in human language to men upon earth what he saw, he would have to say, "What I see is indescribable, but if you think of God as a loving Father, I cannot put the Reality to you in a better way than that; that is the nearest you can get."'

In his recently published book, *Doctrines of the Creed* (reviewed elsewhere), Canon O. C. QUICK has a suggestive chapter on the relevance of belief in God. The modern world is asking with a new insistence the question which transcends every other in importance: Why should we believe in God at all? What is the real value of that belief which is at the centre of traditional religion? Briefly, the answer is that to believe in the one eternal God alone gives us the right to speak and think of the universe as being the universe at all. For, if there be no eternal reality above and beyond the changes and chances of temporal succession, 'the universe' is but a phrase fashioned by man for his convenience which merely falsifies the limitless multiplicity and variety of particular events extending for ever into the darkness of the unknown.

To believe in the goodness of the eternal alone enables us to hope that the tiny efforts any of us make after righteousness and truth can have any abiding consequence or value. For, if there be no eternal reality, the same result of dissolution and extinction will wait on all our achievements in the end. Only look far enough ahead, and selfishness and self-sacrifice, sin and holiness, delusion and enlightenment will all come to the same thing. From such a conclusion belief in God affords the only possible deliverance, if we think coherently. Apart from all logical proofs of theism, therefore, and all doctrines of particular revelation and all mystical experience, the mind of man in its most clear-sighted moments will always retain the substance of belief in God, simply because any real rejection of it involves consequences which are intolerable alike to reason and conscience.

'Brave words,' the sceptic will reply, 'but how is it, then, that so many of the keenest and most influential intellects of our time reject your belief as obsolete and worthless?' This is a quite pertinent question, and must be answered. There are two reasons that explain why the central doctrines of religion are losing their appeal to the human mind. One is the belief which the last century established in general progress and evolution, a belief shared, though with important differences in form, by Marxists, Nationalists, and Humanitarians. To all alike the history of life on this planet is a story of constant development from lower to higher, and the development seems bound somehow to continue. In this respect there is a profound difference between the mind of the ancient and that of the modern world.

The ancients never entertained seriously the notion of general progress. They never saw any reason for thinking that what comes later must be better than what comes earlier. Their golden age was in the past, and any hope of betterment was based on the expectation of a divine intervention, not on the operation of any natural law. But now everybody has a belief in better times ahead. Time is the bringer of all good things, and this prospect provides faith and hope enough to carry people through the present. To seek a reason for this uncritical trust leads us to the second cause of the disfavour into which other-worldliness has fallen.

It is the new control which man by experimental science has won over Nature and is continually extending. The result of it is a quite new consciousness of power which has convinced our generation that human destiny is in human hands. However great may be the dangers, men are sure that they can escape them by the use of their own resources. Here is the great reason why traditional piety and belief in God make so little appeal to the modern world. Salvation lies in some political or economic gospel. For man can do everything that can be done at all by the knowledge and equipment which science puts ready for his use. We can afford to trust the future because there is no limit to what man can do with it. It is this new Titanism of man which has thrust God out of mind and blinded our eyes to the ultimate ends and issues of human living.

Yet it is becoming increasingly evident that modern godlessness must bring what ancient heathenism used to call a nemesis upon its head. When men have abandoned all belief in unchanging and eternal authority over human life, they can reach no agreement as to what ultimate end they ought to pursue, or by what means it is right to pursue it. When there is no agreement on such matters, the appeal is inevitably to force. Accordingly it is to the use of force, physical and psychical, that the adherents of the new gospels betake themselves.

But even the modern world is not allowed to forget that those who take the sword perish with the sword, since force constantly begets force in opposition to itself. And therefore the majority of us live in terror of war, civil, international or economic, which, as experience has shown, must under modern conditions bring disaster to all and victory to none. Of course co-operation could save us. But where is the power that would enable us to co-operate? Government control of press, wireless and education is the modern answer to that question. But official propaganda can only deceive the citizens of one State at a time, and a policy of systematic lying can but increase in the end the confusion it sought to remedy.

But about end and means. We have just said that when belief in eternal realities is abandoned, men can reach no agreement as to the ultimate end they ought to pursue or by what means it is right to pursue it. Well, observe what is actually happening in both respects. As to the *end*: man's destiny being in his own hands and no authority set over him, what end should he live for, what future should he make for himself? Some say, the establishment of a classless society. Others believe in the dominance of one nation or race over others. And so we have the rival gospels of Communism and Nationalism arrayed against each other. What court is to decide between them? There can be no appeal to any eternal principles of right or justice or truth. Nothing can arbitrate but force. And when the guns and bombs and poison gas have done their work, will it matter which side claims victory?

And as to the *means*: if you believe in an eternal principle of right and goodness, the means you take to achieve your good end must be the expression of the same goodness, and morally appropriate to it. If the end is a divine kingdom of righteousness and peace and love, the means you take to move towards it must themselves be the appropriate expression of a righteous, peaceable and loving spirit. For the end you seek is set by eternal principles which lay their authority upon you now.

But if you believe only in some *future* good as the end, there is no reason why your choice of means should be thus limited. Why should not the classless society, which is the Marxist's heaven, be sought by deliberately creating the ruthless dictatorship of the proletariat backed by the methods of the Ogpu? Why should not the noble civilization of the Nationalist's dream issue from an utterly sordid persecution of the Jews? Once men have thoroughly rejected the thought of the Divine, the other-worldly and the eternal, they will inevitably think that they can justify the blackest crimes in the present, because their result will be some glorious Utopia in the future.

Christians think otherwise. St. Paul's teaching at this point makes a particularly instructive contrast to that of some modern missionaries. He also looked for a glorious age in the future. The Kingdom of God is righteousness and joy and peace in the Holy Ghost; and no doubt he was thinking primarily of a future world. But the Kingdom was God's; and therefore it was not future only, but eternal. Therefore, again, he who would enter it fully in the future must begin to enter it now by living according to its law of love even in face of suffering persecution and apparent failure. There is indeed a bringing of good out of evil, of which the Cross of Christ is the sacrament; but the Christian dialectic depends on the eternal consistency of God's love.

And so we return to the essential meaning and value of belief in God. It is not the mere clinging, for comfort and guidance, to the orthodoxy of the past. It is not a bulwark against revolution. Modern society is far too like the world which the New Testament condemns not to stand in need of a revolution as drastic as any Communist could wish. Belief in God is the conviction that we may enter now into communion with that living and eternal will of goodness which, because it is above the changes and chances of time, can alone give meaning to their movement and order them towards an end.

A new book by Professor Ernest F. Scott, D.D., of Union Theological Seminary, is sure of a good welcome. The book before us, *The Validity of the Gospel Record* (Nicholson & Watson; 8s. 6d. net), is the most recent addition to the publishers' series known as 'The International Library of Christian Knowledge.' It represents the author's views on the recent methods of research as applied to the Gospels, particularly on what is known as Form Criticism; and it is written in a clear and popular style.

In the author's opinion much has been done by modern criticism to push farther back, though not to dispel, the darkness which conceals the primitive tradition. The account of Jesus, it may now be said, was first transmitted orally, and consisted of a great number of separate anecdotes and sayings. This record belonged to the community and was preserved in it. It was thus saved from the caprice of individual reporters. While it was still in the oral phase it came to be moulded according to set patterns, to be invested with more or less conventional forms.

'The Meaning of Form' is one of the author's most topical chapters. There he allows that the recent investigation of form has marked a real advance in Gospel criticism. It may be that too much has been claimed for the new method, and that most of its findings will always remain more or less conjectural. But at least a crevice has been opened through which we can see some little way into the background of oral tradition.

The forms in which the record is cast are demonstrably artificial, and it might be concluded that the substance of it has also passed through a process. But when we find a community which called itself by the name of Jesus and sought to order its life by His precepts, we may conclude that its account of Him is substantially true. If the Roman Empire was based on ideas which it ascribed to Cæsar, the natural assumption is that Cæsar was a real person who originated those ideas and with them the Empire which preserved his story.

Artificial though the forms are, they may be in harmony with facts. Any narrator will be found to develop a technique of his own, and the form is usually most rigid when the narrative is most matter-of-fact. 'One has only to think of a business letter, a captain's log-book, a policeman's evidence in court, a scientific demonstration.' Indeed artificial form may be said to be the mark of veracity. In the East, more especially, a loose, flexible mode of narration would cause misgiving.

Forms would be adopted when the danger of corruption of the tradition had become apparent, but could still be overcome; and the transposition into form may be taken to mark the true beginning of a Gospel literature. The record did not shape itself automatically, but was shaped by teachers who understood the finer uses of language. While the chief object of formulation was to preserve and fix the tradition, the further motive was involved of laying hold of those things which it was most desirable to keep.

What determined the selection? Preference would be given to acts and sayings of Jesus which bore more immediately on the present needs of the Church, to incidents which lent confirmation to the beliefs of the Church, especially the central belief that Jesus was the Messiah. But our Gospels are also full of passages which only by a forced ingenuity can be construed as topical, passages which bring out the spiritual value of the story of Jesus and the newness and splendour of His teaching.

In addition to these reasons determining the selection of material Dr. Scott names also anxiety on the part of Christian teachers to transmit an authentic record. It was a matter of practical concern to the Church to become acquainted with the Gospel history. It is not to be supposed, however, that the historical tests which Christian teachers employed were of just the same kind as we should use now. 'As yet there was no clear conception of the laws of historical evidence, no means of determining whether an event was possible within the order of nature.' But if, as appears most likely, the various sections of the record were designed for public recital at the church meeting, we have a strong guarantee that they were framed carefully, with a full sense of responsibility. Nothing that was false or unworthy could be admitted into the worship of the assembled brotherhood.

◆

The Missionary Prophet.

By the Reverend J. H. Morrison, D.D., Bucksburn, Aberdeen.

In the popular mind the Book of Jonah is associated with some ridiculous story about a whale, but to those who have insight and sympathy to discern its real meaning and intention no book in the Old Testament is more astonishing, more sublime, more worthy of reverence. It is years since Cornill wrote of it: 'I have read the Book of Jonah at least a hundred times, and I will publicly avow, for I am not ashamed of my weakness, that I cannot even now take up this marvellous book, nay, nor even speak of it, without the tears rising to my eyes, and my heart beating higher. This apparently trivial book is one of the deepest and grandest that was ever written, and I should like to say to every one who approaches it, "Take off thy shoes, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground."'

It is a book written to teach the universality of God's redeeming love and to enlarge the sympathies of God's people towards all mankind. It was directed in the first instance against Jewish pride and exclusiveness which regarded all heathen nations as lying under the wrath of God and doomed to destruction. The discipline of the Exile, instead of broadening, had narrowed their minds so that later Judaism became more intensely bigoted and exclusive than before. There were illustrious exceptions, and perhaps the greatest of these was the writer of the Book of Jonah. A profoundly thoughtful and religious mind, a truly Christlike spirit, he pondered deeply the meaning of all God's dealings with His chosen people, and especially the significance of the Exile. He worked out under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit a philosophy of Jewish history which though clothed in weird imagery contains lessons of priceless value for the Church of every age.

He embodied his message in a story or parable, not simply because that was a popular form of teaching in the East where it is firmly believed that

> Truth embodied in a tale
> Shall enter in at lowly doors,

but doubtless also because the subject was so highly controversial and provocative that it could hardly bear to be set forth in formal argument. Moreover, it is not an argument we have here, but a tender appeal to the heart.

The first step towards an understanding of the book is to interpret its strange symbolism, strange to us but familiar enough to those for whom it was first written. That Jonah the prophet should represent Israel is quite in accordance with Old Testament usage, for Israel is frequently spoken of in the singular as God's servant or prophet. But the name Jonah is specially apt and well chosen, for it literally means 'a dove,' the messenger of peace, and there are passages where Israel is spoken of by that name (Hos 7^{11} 11^{11}, also probably in the title of Ps 56, which is taken in the Talmud and LXX as referring to Israel in exile). The great fish or sea monster prepared by God is a familiar Hebrew image to denote a heathen empire or power of evil. Every reader of Daniel or the Book of Revelation is acquainted with this style of prophetic speech. Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel all refer to the heathen empires of their day as devouring monsters which God has prepared according to His purpose, which He rules and bridles and which He will finally overthrow. Particularly in Jer 51 there is the closest parallel to the Book of Jonah, where it is said, 'the king of Babylon hath devoured me . . . he hath swallowed me up like a dragon . . . I will bring forth out of his mouth that which he hath swallowed up.' Nothing could more fitly picture the catastrophe of the Exile when God's people were swallowed up, and the miracle of the Return when contrary to all human expectation the monster was made to disgorge his prey. Nineveh was in its day the great city of the heathen world whose downfall was hailed by the Jews and all the oppressed nations with delirious joy as can be read in the Book of Nahum. Its name is compounded of an Assyrian word meaning 'a fish,' so that all these things would very naturally suggest to the prophet's mind the parable of the great fish.

Once the story is looked at in this way it ceases to be grotesque. It is seen to deal with great historic events and religious principles. We can read it, as we read in the *Pilgrim's Progress* of Apollyon and of Giant Despair, without any sense of incongruity but with appreciation and spiritual profit. Like John Bunyan the writer of the Book of Jonah has an exceedingly fine touch and an unerring instinct. Every stroke of the brush tells, and his work can bear to be examined minutely for it is significant down to the last detail. The broad outline of its teaching may be set down as follows.

1. *God's World-wide Purpose of Salvation.* The mission of Jonah to Nineveh is Israel's mission to the heathen world. For nothing less than this high destiny was Israel called and chosen. This was in view from the beginning. The blessing of Abraham had a universal reference, and prophetic souls felt that there could be no bounds to God's Kingdom. So they sang:

> The beam that shines from Sion hill
> Shall lighten ev'ry land;
> The King who reigns in Salem's tow'rs
> Shall all the world command.

This prophetic instinct and this sense of a world-wide mission has become in the Church of the New Testament an explicit command. 'Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.' This is the very end for which the Church exists, and to deny it is to deny the faith.

2. *The Church's Failure.* Jonah refused to obey the divine command and sought to evade his mission. When bidden to go to the East he set out to flee to the remotest West, so completely did he set his face against the will of God. Here is a faithful portrait of the narrowness and bigotry of the Jewish Church which had no sympathy with the heathen, nor any desire for their salvation. On the contrary, there was a grim satisfaction in the thought that the heathen world was ripening for judgment, and Israel exulted in the anticipation of their day of doom. It was an attitude which made friendly intercourse impossible, quenched the missionary spirit, and frustrated the redeeming purpose of God. Not only in the Jewish but also in the Christian Church, as we must sadly confess, there are too many traces of this same attitude and spirit. We may not openly argue, as did some of the Post-Reformation Churches, that the Great Commission to go into all the world was the *personale privilegium* of the Apostles and no longer binding on the Church, but in practice we ignore it and take means to evade our Christian duty.

Jonah's disobedience to the divine command speedily brings him into deep waters. 'There was a mighty tempest in the sea, so that the ship was like to be broken.' When the seamen cast lots to determine for whose cause the trouble had arisen, the lot fell upon Jonah, and he confessed the justice of the decision. 'I know that for my sake this great tempest is upon you.' It is the lesson of Israel's history, a lesson which the prophets were never weary of enforcing, that if only God's people would walk in His ways and fulfil His will, then would their peace be like a river and their righteousness like the waves of the sea. But when they rebelled against God's will then they brought trouble and sorrow upon themselves and upon the world. How different ancient history might have been if Israel had been a dove of peace among the nations!

The world of to-day is a storm centre, and the question arises, Who is responsible? Whatever others may say, the Church at least must be willing in a spirit of sincere penitence to take her full share of the blame. If the Church had cordially accepted and fulfilled her mission, if Christendom had been genuinely Christian and actively missionary, how different the state of the world would have been. Time and again, as history records, tragic failures on the part of the Church have involved the world in a sea of troubles. The corruptions and idolatries of the Early Mediæval Church provoked the reaction of Mohammedanism with all its bloody sequel of wars and persecutions down to the present day. There was a time, too, when the cause of Christ in China was in a most hopeful state, and the Emperor appealed to the Pope for missionaries, but got in reply a bottle of holy water! Or to come to our own day, how much of the blame lies at the door of the Church for all the sea of bloodshed into which the peoples of Russia and of Spain have been plunged? It is terrible to think that great nations, after being under the tutelage of the Church for centuries, should rise up in wrath to throw that Church overboard. Or to come still nearer home, had Protestant Britain given to the extension of Christ's kingdom a tithe of the energy she devoted to imperial expansion, might she not have been God's messenger of peace to all mankind? But she went her own way, to amass wealth and power and territory, and so instead of friendship she stirred great nations to envy and hatred which plunged the world into war and the present sea of troubles. It might be the beginning of better things if the Church would come together in sincere penitence and make confession before the whole world, saying, 'I know that for my sake this great tempest is upon you.'

3. *The Heathen world* is painted with wonderful sympathy, a sympathy rare indeed among the Jews. Look at the sailors, what fine fellows they are! How decent in their treatment of Jonah, and how humane! Even when they know he is

to blame they won't throw him overboard till they have done their utmost to save him. When the Jews were scattered abroad they must have met with many kind and neighbourly people, for there are such people in every age and country. A kindly tea-planter, looking down on a pretty Scottish village, exclaimed, 'I have as many decent hard-working folk in my tea garden as you have down in that village.' To go abroad in a proud spirit, despising the native and brutally saying, 'He understands nothing but the boot,' is the gravest sin and crime against humanity. The heathen have just the same human nature as we have, the same faults and the same virtues.

Moreover, they are religious, and often a reproach to God's people by their devotion. The heathen sailors are at their prayers while Jonah is asleep. Time and again the prophets urge this against Israel that the heathen are more devout. In their blindness they may 'bow down to wood and stone,' but they *do* bow, they have the religious instinct in the highest degree, and they seek after God with an earnestness which may well put God's own people to shame. No wonder then that the gospel, when it comes to such kindly and instinctively religious people, wakens a response. When Jonah preaches to Nineveh, though his message is of judgment rather than of mercy, Nineveh repents. How often has this miracle been repeated down through the Christian ages, and not least in our own time. Cannibals have been won for Christ, and races so degraded as to be counted sub-human have been raised and changed. So that there is now on record, for all who care to read it, abundant and triumphant proof that God's message can touch the universal heart of man, and that the gospel is indeed the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth.

4. Finally, *God's infinite pity is movingly set forth.* Jonah was only half converted, as the Church still is on the subject of missions. Jonah had carried out his mission as a duty, but with little faith and love. He is disappointed that Nineveh should escape judgment upon its sins. He is jealous of that heathen city getting a share of God's favour. He is like the elder brother in the parable who, when he heard the music that welcomed the prodigal's return, 'was angry and would not go in.' This was not only the attitude of the Jewish Church generally but it depicts the feelings of many in the Apostolic Church who could not believe it possible that God had 'granted to the gentiles repentance unto life.' It takes a high degree of the grace of God to purge the heart from such feelings. It is so natural to feel jealous and resentful when peoples and races, which have been counted inferior, claim a share in the Christian heritage and an equal standing within the Christian brotherhood. Missionaries of experience have confessed that what they found hardest of all was to preach the gospel without condescension and in a genuine spirit of brotherly love.

But the prophet's narrowness is rebuked by the infinite pity and patience of God. He looks down on Nineveh and sees not merely its heathenism but its home life, not merely its kings and warriors but the masses of its toiling people, its scores of thousands of helpless infants, even its dumb animals. Nothing kindles sympathy like the actual sight of helplessness and suffering. When we see thousands of little Spanish children brought weeping to our shores every heart is moved. But the heathen are far away and no concern of ours, we think. Because we do not actually see we do not acutely feel. If we could but see as God sees, then perhaps we should learn in some degree to pity as He pities. It is indeed a sublime picture which is here given of God's pity for Nineveh, and a picture which brings comfort to the heart. These ancient cities and civilizations have long since gone down to the dust, without knowledge of the true God and Saviour, but all the while His watchful eye was upon them and His fatherly love brooded over them, and they all have fallen into His hands who, as Jonah confessed, is 'a gracious God, and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness.' And there we leave them.

But if any should imagine that this is reason why we may leave the heathen of our day to the uncovenanted mercies of God, then let it be noted that God's pity for Nineveh expressed itself in sending to them His Word through the mouth of His servant Jonah. Nineveh was not saved without Jonah; his preaching brought them to repentance, and made them fit to receive God's mercy. Even so is the Church of to-day commissioned and enjoined to carry the saving word to the heathen world, and through that message to become the means of salvation to all mankind. It is a work of infinite value which may avert wars and sufferings and judgments untold. If that work be neglected and left undone, then the question may be, not about the final destiny of the heathen, but whether the Church itself can be saved.

What Jesus made of Men.[1]

By the Reverend Edward Shillito, M.A., B.A., Buckhurst Hill, Essex.

The reader who seeks to discover in the Gospels what Jesus thought of men, and how He dealt with them, will find an answer both consistent and arresting. Jesus, as He was remembered in the Early Church, had a way of His own in dealing with individual men and women. In a study of this way it is not necessary to enter upon critical problems; the evidence is too widely spread and too convincing to admit of any doubt that such was the mind of Jesus, as His people remembered Him. He left them in no doubt of what He made of man.

It is clear that when some individual man came into personal dealings with Him, He looked first of all with an unprejudiced eye upon him; He was not prepared to classify him finally with a larger company; He does not appear to have made much use of the labels, which were in use in His day, but He was not in the least blind to the plain realities to which these labels bore witness. It *was* a matter of importance whether a man was a Jew or a Gentile, but only on a certain level of life. There was a deeper level with which He was concerned. On that level there is neither Jew nor Greek even as there is neither male nor female.

I.

In St. Matthew there is, to take the first illustration, the story of the Roman centurion, who besought Jesus to heal his boy. The man, as he approached Jesus, could be described according to his race, class, profession, wealth, and even religion. But in his dealing with Jesus he revealed what he was upon another and deeper level. He showed what our Lord was always seeking, and finding in strange places.

> 'The centurion answered and said, Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof; but speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed.'[2]

There was in him that singleness of mind which leads a man to be ready to venture all upon a call, that comes to him with authority. He was among the pure in heart who shall see God.

That mattered supremely; on the other levels of his life he might be justly and usefully described as a Roman, a pagan, a soldier, a master of a household; but when Jesus descended to that deeper level in which faith is revealed, He did not let the other classifications modify His verdict:

> 'When Jesus heard it, he marvelled, and said to them that followed, Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.'

Then, as always, beginning from the one life before Him, Jesus let His imagination go forward into the future. He saw in this man the forerunner of a great multitude of men, like-minded with him, who would come into the Kingdom of Heaven from the East and West. It was not only of the tragedy of Israel as He saw it, when the children of the Kingdom should be cast out into outer darkness, that He was thinking; but of the members of the new Israel who should march with the light of faith in their eyes into the blessed Kingdom. Only one man, and that man an alien from the Israel as men knew it! Jesus saw in that one man the promise of the new Israel of which such men as that would be the first-born.

II.

There is that same method revealed in the story of the confession of Simon at Cæsarea Philippi.

> 'And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.
>
> And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.
>
> And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.'[3]

The Simon who comes into this scene could be described in perfectly correct terms as a Galilean and a fisherman; he has been somewhat extravagantly called by Mr. Chesterton, 'a shuffler, a snob, and a coward'; at least it must be admitted that in the story he is known as a man of impulsive moods, taking his colour from his company. The rock, so far, was a hidden rock. But once more Jesus had penetrated to that level upon which faith is revealed. That made all the difference in His eyes. There was only one man before him, and that man only on the threshold of the new life, but Jesus saw a Church. Whatever these difficult words may mean, they must imply that in the Early Church it was not thought impossible or even strange that Jesus in His earthly life should look upon a man who had shown faith and see—a Church rising, because of that man's confession and the faith which blazed up in that moment.

---

[1] Mt 8^{8-13} 16^{15-18}, Lk 19^{9-10} $23^{42.\ 43}$.

[2] Mt 8^{8}.

[3] Mt 16^{16-18}.

When Robert Louis Stevenson wrote to his mother about his friend, James Chalmers, the missionary whom he called, as the Papuans did, Tamate, he said: 'He has plenty faults like the rest of us, but he is big as a Church.' There was something of the same imaginative insight in these words, as that which can be discovered in the words of our Lord. Whatever else there is in these words, there is this at least; Jesus was not prepared to read the personality of Simon by what we should call the card-indexes in common use. Simon, yielding to the Voice which had spoken to him, was a new fact in the life of the world, and new hopes and promises were to be released in him: in his blood 'the great age slept sepulchred.' Now Jesus saw the stone rolled away.

III.

The story of Zacchæus reveals the same fearless method and the same vision. It is a story perfect in the economy of language. The picture has very few lines. Yet no one can mistake the truth that is set forth in it. Zacchæus was well known, and put in his right place in Jericho. He was a publican, to be numbered among the sinners and outcasts, more to be despised than even a dog of a Gentile. He was treated as an enemy of society:

> 'And, behold, there was a man named Zacchæus, which was the chief among the publicans, and he was rich.
>
> And he sought to see Jesus who he was; and could not for the press, because he was little of stature.
>
> And he ran before, and climbed up into a sycomore tree to see him: for he was to pass that way.'[1]

The story would certainly not have been preserved unless there had been in it an illustration of something characteristic of Jesus, as He was remembered. It is not the story of a miracle of healing, but of what might have been rightly called a miracle of spiritual healing. It must have seemed one out of many examples of such acts of healing. But the story would be without meaning if there was not in the publican the beginnings of a capacity for the new life. There was a hidden Zacchæus, whom no one in Jericho suspected to be there. It is simply said that he sought to see Jesus; such seeking might be little more than curiosity, but all the human quest for knowledge began with curiosity; and such curiosity as Zacchæus showed had within it the seed of faith.

When Jesus passed that way He saw a face in the sycomore tree; but it was not the face of a publican and a sinner, but the face of the hidden and unknown Zacchæus. The card-index of Jericho was correct as far as it went. But it did not describe that other level upon which Jesus looked. He came to seek one who was lost.

The familiar story ends with the words:

> 'And Jesus said unto him, This day is salvation come to this house, forsomuch as he also is a son of Abraham.
>
> For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost.'[2]

Upon the significance of this saying of Jesus much might be said by the critical student; but as it is used in this story, it must mean that Jesus had found in Zacchæus a son of Abraham waiting to be released. That hidden Zacchæus had been lost in the heart of a human society in the city of Jericho. Jesus had come to seek and to save such lost souls. Nothing more was needed than the dawning of faith. Jesus saw a new vision of that city to which Zacchæus belonged. It was made the richer by the entrance into it of a son of Abraham. Salvation came to the house of that publican. But salvation could not be understood without the vision of what it would involve for other lives. The presence in Jericho of a new Zacchæus would be a new fact in the life of the city. One penitent publican! But Jesus saw more than that one man. He looked into the future, and saw the way that lay before that man, and what his new life would bring. All that future He had seen in promise when He looked at the face looking down upon Him from the sycomore tree. Given the rudiments of faith, the rest followed.

---

[1] Lk 19^{2-4}.

[2] Lk $19^{9.10}$.

It is the same Jesus dealing in the same way with Zacchæus as He had done with the Roman centurion and with Simon.

To the last He followed the same quest and showed the same freedom and daring.

What if there were no future for the soul upon this earth? What, then, could He see as He looked into the future? The story of the Dying Thief has been told countless times for the comfort of those whose time is short. It has been read as though it taught the lesson:

> Between the saddle and the ground,
> He mercy sought and mercy found.

Yet as the story was told to the first hearers, it must have meant more than that. It tells how Jesus carried forward the life of the Thief into the unseen.

> 'And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.
>
> And Jesus said unto him, Verily, I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.'[1]

This is rightly called a story of faith, and it was the faith, which to Jesus was the one thing needful. 'To see, in the white, worn, bleeding flesh of a crucified convict, the Lord of Life and of Death, was no exercise of ordinary, or scientific, reason in the mind of the penitent thief. But it was true insight, as true, not the less but the more, for that.' 'The difference was a moral and spiritual difference between the many who saw in Jesus crucified, a detected and defeated impostor, and the one who there bowed his soul in homage, and in prayer, to the Lord and King of the Life which is beyond death.'[2] It was, once more, on this level that the penitent thief and the Lord met. Jesus did not see in the dying man by His side a desperate brigand, perhaps a nationalist outlaw, paying for his wild and lawless deeds by his death. The one thing that mattered in that hour was the man's faith. On the level which was revealed this man showed insight, the insight which came from faith. That was enough.

> 'This day shalt thou be with me in paradise.'

To others Jesus had said, 'Go to your home, and tell what great things God hath done for you.' He could not say such words to this man. Any future for him must be found beyond the bounds of time and place. Yet on the Cross the Saviour, knowing the faith of the dying man, looked into the future before him. This also was remembered by the Early Church in the records of Calvary; Jesus in dying had traced out for this companion of His a future scene, in which his faith would be unfolded. He who had looked so often into the new life for others on this earth into which their faith would lead them, now at the end still looked forward, only now upon that other shore.

> 'This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.'

In one of the noblest religious poems of this age, J. S. Phillimore[3] wrote to the honour of the good thief, who by St. Cyprian was reckoned among the martyrs who are baptized in their own blood. This poem is true to the spirit of the Gospels, and not the less true because of its very daring.

Did ever paladin adventuring out
  To face the great uncharted enterprise,
Choose for companion in the crucial bout
  A sorrier squire with whom to agonize?
    Yet in that earthquake-darkened afternoon
    Of dereliction, when the seventh sword
      So pierced the Dolorous Mother's heart that she
  Was fallen dumb in swoon,
  Thou midst the railers didst salute thy Lord,
    Thou hadst the heart to cry, *Remember me*.

'Thou shalt be with me in Paradise.' It was a fitting close to that Divine Life that our Lord should go forth into the unseen with this man for whom the world had no use. It was like Him, as He is pictured to us, to see in that man by His side a companion to be with Him when the long agony was over. He could see beyond the horizon of this earthly life. For Him there was no call to despair even though to such penitence as He knew the Thief could give no expression in this life. It was too late for that now. But the imagination of Jesus was not bounded by death. It is still true that there can be no belief in the sacredness of the individual human life which does not rest upon a belief in the eternal world and in the God who is not the God of the dead but of the living.

Wherever we pause to reflect upon the memorabilia of Jesus, we find Him always the same in His dealings with men. He is always a realist, not one of the 'vision-weaving tribe.' He is always in quest of that other and deeper level of which the judgments in common use take little account. He is always free from bondage to the merely outward and conventional judgments. He is a merchantman seeking for one treasure which far outvalues all others. When He finds that treasure, Faith, He can see it in its unfoldings in this life and beyond. He can read the future of a multitude in one man; He can see a Church rising when one man confesses Him: He can see a Son of Abraham when one publican looks curiously upon Him, and in a dying brigand He can see a companion with whom to cross the threshold of the unseen world.

---

[1] Lk $23^{42.43}$.

[2] R. C. Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*.

[3] *Things New and Old.*

That is the picture of the Lord whom men remembered. It is little wonder that they have said of Him:

> For oh, the Master is so fair,
>   His smile so sweet to banished men,
> That they who meet Him unaware,
>   Can never rest on earth again.
>
> And they who see Him ris'n afar
>   At God's right hand to welcome them,
> Forgetful stand of home and land,
>   Remembering Jerusalem.

There is also judgment in His clear eyes, but it is never a judgment divorced from faith and hope and love. Men when they bowed beneath His judgment never doubted His eager quest of them, nor the vision that He had of them.

Literature.

DOCTRINES OF THE CREED.

Canon Oliver C. Quick, M.A., D.D., has just produced a book of remarkable interest and value—*Doctrines of the Creed: Their Basis in Scripture and their Meaning To-day* (Nisbet; 10s. 6d. net). Canon Quick is Professor of Divinity in the University of Durham, and this volume is no doubt part of the fruit of his prelections in that seat of learning. He describes the book as an essay in systematic theology, and makes a careful discrimination between systematic theology and dogmatic theology. The latter concerns itself mainly with the genesis and original significance of traditional dogma, and, in so far as it turns its attention from the past to the present, it seeks only to answer the question: What does the Church teach as *de fide*? On the other hand systematic theology asks the question: How can we best understand and interpret as a coherent whole the doctrinal tradition of our church in relation to that particular world in which we are now called upon to uphold the Christian faith?

If that somewhat unusual distinction be real, it is obvious that it must be very difficult to maintain it in actual practice. And indeed Dr. Quick hardly succeeds in doing so. It is impracticable to commend a doctrine to our intelligence without a reference to its original significance and to its genesis. And indeed it is difficult to present a doctrine persuasively without offering a defence of it. And we are not surprised, or disappointed, to find both dogmatic theology and apologetics in this able and suggestive essay. But in the main Dr. Quick may quite justly claim that the purpose inherent in systematic theology has been the main purpose of his lectures.

The book has four parts, expounding the four great doctrines of the Creed: The Christian Faith in God, The Incarnation, The Christian Doctrine of Salvation, and The Holy Spirit and the Church. Under these headings all the main issues raised for belief are faced and explored with a grasp and insight that furnish a sustained intellectual satisfaction. As a proof of the thoroughness of the treatment of these themes it may be mentioned that in the second section of the book we have discussions of the Jewish background of Christology, a particularly able refutation of the supposed Hellenic influence on St. Paul, a chapter on 'The Incarnation and Historical Criticism,' an intelligent but unsatisfactory chapter on the Virgin Birth, as well as brief consideration of such points as our Lord's knowledge in His earthly life. The one marked omission is any direct reference to the doctrine of Scripture. It is true that the whole book is an exposition of Scripture teaching, but it would naturally be expected that the belief in the

Bible itself on which the doctrines of the Creed finally rest should be presented ‘ in relation to that particular world in which we are now called upon to uphold the Christian faith.’ Even if the ‘ creeds ’ do not specifically contain a doctrine of Scripture, the particular world in which we live very much needs a justification of our belief in it.

One criticism which is more serious concerns the apologetic side of Dr. Quick’s presentation of doctrine. This may be best put in a concrete instance. In his chapter on the Virgin Birth, after explaining (inadequately) the evidence on both sides, for and against, Dr. Quick sums up as follows: ‘ The historical evidence being inconclusive, it is theology which must determine our belief whether or not the Virgin Birth is a historical fact. If the Virgin Birth seems to us to be an integral of the Christian gospel, and in particular of the doctrine of the Incarnation, we shall naturally and reasonably affirm it.’ That is an extraordinary position. And the attitude in it is taken in other parts of the argument. To many not unsympathetic and not unresponsive readers it will appear a definite weakness. But it need not be too much emphasized. What ought to be said is that this book, by one of the ablest theologians in the Anglican Church, is an important and in many ways brilliant contribution to theology for which we may well be profoundly grateful.

RELIGION IN SOCIAL ACTION.

Religion in Social Action, by Mr. Maurice B. Reckitt, M.A. (Unicorn Press; 3s. 6d. net), is a very valuable addition to the Christian Challenge series. ‘ My theme,’ says the author, ‘ is the task of the Church in the world situation of to-day.’ The book might be roughly divided into two parts: diagnosis and prescription.

Mr. Reckitt’s diagnosis of the world situation to-day is that it is far too serious to admit of cure by any nostrum so simple as ‘ a new spirit ’ in industry or in international affairs. The Church has always a prophetic duty to indicate the real ends of social and economic life; but, since the Renaissance, it has abdicated from its throne, with the result that economic life has been considered as an end in itself rather than a means to the well-being of men and women as children of God. Thus it is not merely a new spirit within the framework of the present system which is required; it is a radically new direction, a change of structure to answer the change of heart. Christianity cannot join forces with Fascism or Communism, but it is also critical of secularist democracy—for all these philosophies rest on a non-Christian conception of man.

The problem of war is treated in a similar manner. Not committing himself to pacifism, the author says that the main problem is not how to deal with the apparently quite unreasonable wickedness of individuals and groups who cause wars. The real question is, why are the nations inevitably drifting towards war in spite of the herculæan efforts of statesmen to prevent it? Is the reason not that our economic life is aiming at wrong, and really impossible, ends? ‘ Does any one,’ he asks, ‘ believe that a population enjoying reasonable security, able to consume or exchange all or most of what it would make . . . could be worked up to the pitch of hysterical immolation which the physically and psychically starved populations of Italy and Germany have now reached? ’

Mr. Reckitt is not just dishing up once more the old doctrine of economic determinism, for he believes that the secularist view of society is the foundation of the bankrupt economic system, and that it is part of the prophetic duty of the Church radically to challenge this view of society. The economist’s task is really to see what means are best fitted to secure the ends legislated for him by religion.

No full account can here be given of the author’s prescription for the disease. His fundamental principle is found in a statement of F. D. Maurice, ‘ Society is not to be made anew by arrangements of ours, but is to be regenerated by finding the law and ground of its order and harmony, the only secret of its existence, in God.’

The aims of the Christian community to-day must be threefold.

Firstly, social revolution. This is to be achieved in a manner different from the violence of the contemporary revolutionary movements—and without the illusive hope that it will put an end to the moral and practical problems of man as a social being. But it will allow those problems to be seen in their true nature, and to be met with a new energy of mind and spirit.

Secondly, direct action against such evils as malnutrition and bad housing and local unemployment. Christians should bring Christian standards of judgment to bear upon the political causes and social programmes which they support, and must bring an informed interest to bear upon problems of local administration with the same objects.

Thirdly, first aid. We must remember that social problems concern us as Christians because they involve men and women created in God’s image, and must take action accordingly through social service or corporal works of mercy.

This is a fine book, full of careful statement and thought. If there be a criticism to make, it is this. Mr. Reckitt is speaking of the task of the Church in the world situation of to-day, and no doubt he takes for granted the duty of the Church to evangelize. But we are just too apt to take it for granted, and not realize how inadequately we are doing it. In order that the Christian Church should do its duty in this world situation it is first necessary that there should be a virile and active Christian Church. Mr. Reckitt has seen the great weakness of an evangelism that was not revolutionary enough—that was willing and content to seek for a Christian spirit within a framework of society that was anything but Christian. But on his side he neglects to notice the necessity for evangelism which should be undertaken by the Christian Community. Certainly under the heading of 'Direct Action' he does not suggest the inclusion of such evangelistic work. Perhaps in his reference to the need of Christian 'cells' to parallel the Communist cells he includes such work as part of the duty of these cells, but his language is ambiguous.

But this is the only criticism which can be offered of a book which is a piece of fine, clear, independent thinking, and is worth reading and re-reading.

WESLEY'S ENGLAND.

Dr. J. H. Whiteley has written an absorbingly interesting book on the England of Wesley—*Wesley's England* (Epworth Press; 10s. 6d. net). It is packed with useful information, and gives a realistic picture of the life and manners of the eighteenth century. Here we have information about population and roads, about work and workers, about government, law and order, about the literature of the period, education, church and chapel. Dr. Whiteley has a detailed and accurate knowledge of the period, and handles his material with great skill. His work shows careful research, and brings to our notice a good deal of out-of-the-way information. By reading this book we can live in the days of Wesley and become citizens of that period.

It was a century of growth in population. 'The century saw its population increase from five and a half millions to over nine; a stupendous progression when the very high rates of mortality then prevailing are remembered.'

The more this book is studied the more shall we realize how much the century needed a revival. Here we see the segregation of the classes—the small band of educated men, the drunken squires, the hunting parsons, and the great mass of ignorant people. There were only two courses open to England—Revolution or Revival. By the grace of God change came by Revival. Dr. Whiteley shows us the heavy drinking habits of this age, 'when Pitt's love for port enabled him, as he expressed it, "always to see two Speakers when addressing the House."' He takes us to the gambling clubs of the west of London, where we see the aristocracy at play. He tells us that 'Before he was twenty-four years old Fox owed the Jews £100,000 lost at cards and dice.' Another chief evil of the period was the drinking of gin. 'Ale houses had to be licensed, but the sale of gin was to all intents and purposes unchecked. . . . By 1750 Fielding was declaring: "gin is the principal sustenance of more than 1,000,000 people in the metropolis."'

Dr. Whiteley gives us a most interesting chapter on the speech of the eighteenth century: it will be of great help to all who are students of words, and will shed some light on the question of rhyme. It is, of course, possible to exaggerate the evil of this age—but it certainly preponderated. Much of its life was brutal and hard. The coming of the Revival brought in a new philanthropy and tenderness.

This book, which deals specially with the background of the century, will give to us a fuller understanding of the work and triumphs of the Revival. Dr. Whiteley has written a book which will be indispensable to all students of the Revival.

THE CHRISTIANS OF ST. THOMAS.

At the Faith and Order Conference in Edinburgh in August of last year one of the delegates was 'His Holiness Moran Mar Basilius Guvarghese II., Catholicos of the East.' He lives in Kottayam, Travancore, South India, and is the head of one of the rival sections that claim to be the true successors of the ancient 'Thomas Christians' of India. The tragic—and also heroic—record of this Church is told by the Rev. F. E. Keay in a useful volume called *The History of the Syrian Church in India* (S.P.C.K., Madras; 12 annas). The heroic aspect of the story can be conjectured from the fact that this little Church has lived on through many centuries in the midst of a hostile and heathen environment and maintained its witness, a flame never wholly quenched. And to-day the Syrian Christian is exercising a wide and increasing influence throughout the whole of India.

What this Church actually endured in the earlier centuries of its history cannot now be known.

No doubt the Christians of Malabar were more fortunate than those of Persia in being beyond the reach of the Muslim conqueror. The rule of the Hindu King of Cochin was milder than that of Tamerlane. Dr. Farquhar suggests that their steadfastness may have been greater because the truth they clung to reached back to an apostolic source. Dr. Keay, like Dr. Farquhar, and indeed like all of us, would like to believe that the old legend of their origin was well grounded. In any case it seems to be fairly certain that this Christian Church has existed in India for sixteen centuries.

The recent history of this Church, which is told in some detail by Dr. Keay, has been scarcely less chequered than its earlier history was. In judging of the contentions that have rent the Church so grievously in recent times we must take into account the great difficulty that arises from the fact that it is under the nominal control of the Patriarch of Antioch, who has only the most shadowy of relations with it and yet has power to make and unmake its spiritual leaders. The result is that there are said to be established at Kottayam a larger number of Bishops than anywhere else in Christendom. Many efforts have been made by such friends of the Church as the present Lord Halifax and the late Bishop Gore to heal the strife that has so weakened its spiritual influence and retarded its progress. The finest of its sons, notably a group educated in the Madras Christian College, deplore these internecine feuds and are doing all they can to bring them to an end and to create a new spirit of brotherhood and a new sense of the challenge that comes to them as Christian witnesses in a land with which they have ties so intimate and so ancient. Nor can Christians of a later date like ourselves refuse our sympathy and our help to these our elder brothers in Christ. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle tells us that in 883 King Alfred sent gifts ‘ to India to St. Thomas,’ and those who read Dr. Keay’s book may well be moved to do the same to-day. One aim of the book is to help on the cause of Church Union in South India and every one must agree with its author that a united Church with the Syrian Christians bringing their ancient tradition into it would be the most effective of all apostles to India of the Lord Jesus Christ.

MAN’S RELIGIOUS HISTORY.

In *The “ Truth ” of the Bible* (S.P.C.K.; 9s. net) Dr. Stanley A. Cook continues to develop and expand the line of thought adumbrated in ‘ The Old Testament: A Reinterpretation.’ The earlier volume was a statement of the writer’s theory of religious history as a process which, though continuous, is yet marked by great epoch-making crises, each of which determines the course taken in the succeeding age. Thus in the new volume we have distinguished the first great period, going back to Abrahamic times, the second is the Mosaic (though Dr. Cook lays no stress on Abraham and Moses as historical personages), the third is inaugurated by Deutero-Isaiah, and the fourth is the Christian era—up-to-date. To-day, it seems, we stand on the threshold of a fifth age, and what form that will take no man yet can say. Within the various epochs there are other and lesser crises, for example, the rise of the eighth-century prophets in Israel, the Maccabean struggle, and the Reformation.

A superficial glance at the title may suggest that Dr. Cook is in doubt as to whether Truth is to be found in the Bible. He does well, therefore, to give an entirely satisfactory explanation of his use of the inverted commas. They are intended to make the reader ask himself what kind of truth he expects to find in the Bible (p. 204), in other words, what is its permanent value, and how that value may best be won and used. As a matter of fact, this is not so much a book about the Bible as a general study of human life, thought, and religion, in which the Bible plays a prominent part. The earlier chapters, it is true, contain some account of the message of Scripture, but these form a part of the introduction to the main theme, discussed especially in the last three chapters.

The reader cannot fail to be impressed by the breadth of vision, the wide area of learning, and the passion for truth, which Professor Cook manifests. We should expect from him an accurate knowledge of Palestinian archæology and of the Bible, but we have here also an extensive acquaintance with comparative religion and a freedom in handling philosophical and scientific themes which make his work one of the most remarkable of recent books. He quotes freely from writers of all kinds, and it is interesting to note that he records a special debt of gratitude to the late A. B. Davidson. But he knows Karl Marx almost as well.

While the book is full of great sentences, thought-provoking and illuminating, it is not always easy to follow Dr. Cook’s main line of thought. We shall not be far wrong, however, if we interpret his aim as the presentation of man’s religious history, in the widest sense, in such a form as to indicate the nature of the present crisis. We do not get the impression that he is attempting to sketch the line which the new age will take, or to prescribe some panacea which will set the world right; his aim is diagnosis rather than treatment. But underlying the whole we are conscious of the grandly optimistic conviction that man is on the verge of new and stupendous discoveries in the spiritual realm, which shall determine the course of human religion for untold centuries to come. It is significant that he ends with the Cross—'the symbol . . . which stands on a hill, apart . . . the assurance that it is not men alone whose concern is with the history and conditions of men, but that behind and above all is Divine Love.'

THE HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS TOLERATION IN ENGLAND.

There has been issued the third volume of Dr. W. K. Jordan's massive and learned work—*The Development of Religious Toleration in England* (Allen & Unwin; 21s. net). It covers the period from the Convention of the Long Parliament to the Restoration, 1640–1660. It is not in the least derogatory to the two previous volumes to say that this one is calculated to arouse keenest interest, for it covers a very sensational twenty years during which the foundations of civil and religious liberty were being laid not only in the Senate but in the Field, and Anglicans and Presbyterians were in turn dispossessed, while other denominations and sects were making their own contribution towards toleration. Dr. Jordan's work is one which deserves, and no doubt will keep, a permanent place in the literature of the subject. That there is widespread interest in the topic is proved by the number of books that have recently appeared dealing with it. None of these, however, is on anything like the scale to which Dr. Jordan is working, and we are sure that for long his volume will abide as the standard work of reference. His task, as he has conceived and worked it out, is laborious and exhaustive. Every important statement is carefully 'documented,' and the whole is impartial or scientific in temper.

We can only briefly indicate the contents. We have first the rise and collapse of Presbyterian Dominance; then the period of Independent Dominance; then two sections dealing with the relation to Toleration of Presbyterian and Independent and Baptist thought respectively.

Within the period under review the principles of Toleration with which we are to-day familiar were not seldom well stated, although the times were not then altogether ripe for their practice. Dr. Jordan does full justice to all, and reminds us how excellently Cromwell formulated Toleration as the State policy, and how impressive was the demonstration that 'religious freedom offers no terrors to the godly.' 'Contrary to the gloomy predictions of the orthodox, England was not engulfed in heresy, nor was piety destroyed.'

A work like this is of more than merely academic interest. For we live in a time which sees liberty curtailed in many quarters; and a perusal of this volume and its predecessors will confirm our faith in freedom of thought and opinion.

UNITARIANISM AND SOCIAL PROGRESS.

In his book on *The Unitarian Contribution to Social Progress in England* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net) Mr. Raymond V. Holt, M.A., B.Litt., Tutor and Librarian of Manchester College, Oxford, gives, it may be, an exaggerated impression of the influence of the Unitarian Movement on social progress in England; but undoubtedly that influence has been great. The exaggerated impression, if it is given, would be due not so much to what the author claims for the movement as to the method of his book. When one turns to his chapters on the Unitarian contribution to the industrial revolution, Parliamentary reform, the new social order, local government, and education, one discovers that these contain a good deal of useful general matter as well as matter strictly relevant to the theme which is being investigated. The general matter might quite well be presented apart from the specific Unitarian reference.

Besides the chapters above mentioned there are two chapters on the Unitarian movement, one on the creation of the Unitarian tradition, and the other on the structure of Unitarianism and nineteenth-century changes. They are informative chapters, such as could be supplied only by one who had access to the large body of Unitarian biographies and congregational histories. We see no reason why those chapters should not have come at the beginning rather than at the end of the work; and the advantage to the ordinary reader is fairly obvious.

It may be added that the word 'Unitarian' is used in this book in a comprehensive sense, but that it is applied particularly 'to those members of English dissenting congregations who developed heretical views about the middle of the eighteenth century' and 'to members of those congregations founded later which were Unitarian from the outset.' The oldest Unitarian congregations, it should perhaps be observed, grew out of Puritan congregations of the seventeenth century.

ENGLAND: BEFORE AND AFTER WESLEY.

Dr. J. Wesley Bready in his book, *England: Before and After Wesley* (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net), gives us a picture of the life of England in the days before and after the coming of Wesley and the Evangelical Revival. He says, 'Look on this picture, and on that.' He shows the difference between the one period and the other—pointing out the grim brutality, the low ideals, the profanity, the materialism of the pre-Wesley days, and showing that in the Wesley and post-Wesley period much of the brutality and materialism passed away, and that a new temper and climate came into the life of the nation. He seeks to show, and gives much evidence, that the change was brought by the Evangelical Revival. It is obvious that, in the realm of spiritual religion, the Wesleys and their followers led many of the people of England out of the wilderness into the promised land. Dr. Bready, however, insists that their influence was much wider. He realizes that the passion and pity of the Evangelical Revival broke the frost, and made warm streams to flow in many departments of English life, transforming the social and economic conditions to a greater degree than many historians have realized.

We believe that Dr. Bready is correct in this judgment. He rightly says, 'The current modern notion that the Evangelical Revival was ridiculously individualistic and morbidly "other-worldly" is completely false.' There is, at times, as Dr. Bready points out, more than a trace of the conservative in John Wesley—but, remembering this, he does well to recall the words of Canon Overton: 'John Wesley was the most revolutionary Tory who ever lived.' He had no sympathy with solitary religion. He instilled his followers with ideas of social religion. We agree with Dr. Bready's saying, 'Two maxims of Wesley were indelibly impressed upon all true Evangelical tradition: (1) "The Gospel of Christ knows of no religion but social, no holiness but social holiness," (2) "I look upon the world as my parish."' The social and missionary activities of Wesley reveal how true he was to his own teaching. Dr. Bready shows clearly that, through the influence and spirit of the Revival, hospitals were built, the slave-trade was stopped, the slaves were freed, child-labour was abolished, factory legislation was introduced. At times, in anxiety to establish his thesis, he seems to overlook other influences—not Evangelical—which made their contribution. Dr. Bready has given to us a most valuable book. We hope and believe that it will have a wide circulation.

JUDAICA.

The *Hebrew Union College Annual*, xii.–xiii. (1937–38) (Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati) is, as we have learnt to expect, a rich mine of information for the study of Judaism in all its aspects. Biblical studies, for instance, are represented by two or three articles. The chief of these is the continuation of Morgenstern's work on Amos; the new instalment deals especially with the date of his prophecies, and identifies the 'earthquake' as that mentioned by Josephus as occurring in the reign of Uzziah. Israel Eitan offers some interesting notes (not all of them new) on the text and interpretation of Isaiah. Traditions regarding Biblical characters appear in Sheldon H. Blank's discussion of the Death of Zechariah, and in an article by Joshua Finkel on an Arabic story of Abraham. The volume is particularly rich in philological studies. The most interesting is an ambitious and brilliant attempt by Alexander Sperber to reconstruct the grammar of the Hebrew language from Greek and Latin transliterations, especially, of course, from Origen, and so to reach a stage earlier than that represented by Massoretic tradition. Other philological material is supplied by Julius Lewy, Joseph Reider, and Henry Englander. There is an acute study of the Mishnah text in Babylonia by Kahle, and Rabbinic Literature is further represented in Jacob Mann's publication of an early theologico-polemical work, directed against Jewish heretics and others, and a fragment of a new Midrash on Deuteronomy. In both cases the Hebrew text is printed *in extenso*. There is an interesting account (in modern Hebrew) of the Jewish synagogues of Alexandria, and Jehudah Fries-Horen gives some suggestions and corrections on the text of a famous commentary. Mediæval Judaism is represented by the study of a detail in the life of Maimonides, and by a comparison between the fasts of Judaism and those of Islam. There is also an additional list of mediæval Hebrew poetry by Israel Davidson. To the modern period belong Israel Bettan's study of the sermons of Isaac Arama, Cecil Roth's additions to an earlier article on 'Revolutionary Purims,' and the chief editor's account of the correspondence between Max Lilienthal and S. D. Luzzato. The volume as a whole is rich and varied, with an appeal to all types of mind interested in Judaism, ancient or modern.

Two years ago the Chief Rabbi completed his edition of the Pentateuch with the publication of the volume on Deuteronomy. Dr. Hertz has now re-issued the whole of his work in a single volume —*The Pentateuch and Haftorahs*, Hebrew Text, English Translation and Commentary (Soncino Press; 8s. 6d. net). The new edition has the Hebrew and English texts side by side on the same page, with the notes in two columns at the foot of the page. The format is somewhat larger than that of the separate volumes, and the type is smaller, but still clear and easy to read, both in English and in Hebrew. Those who have found Dr. Hertz's notes to be of value will appreciate the appearance of this handy and well-produced form of his work.

The Chief Rabbi celebrates his silver jubilee this year, and the publication just mentioned may be in a sense a memorial volume. Certainly we may look on another work of his in that light. This is a collection of *Sermons, Addresses and Studies* in three volumes (Soncino Press; 21s. net). We have here an expression of opinion on a large variety of subjects. The sermons, for instance, are of different types; some deal with special festivals, some are concerned with great crises in the life of the Jewish people and of the world in general. Among the most attractive are the memorial sermons; naturally Dr. Hertz has had something to say of every great British Jew who has passed away during the last twenty-five years. Many of the addresses were delivered on special occasions, as at the opening of conferences called to consider some aspect of Jewish life and faith. One particularly interesting group is connected with the Chief Rabbi's tour of the British Dominions in 1920–21. The 'Studies' are mainly theological, and the majority of them are 'additional notes' reprinted from the Commentary on the Pentateuch. From the whole we get an interesting picture of a striking personality. We see Dr. Hertz as a scholar without pedantry, who knows how to bring his learning within the reach of the ordinary man, as a controversialist who is prepared to defend Jewish nationality and faith against all attacks, as a pastor with a deep concern for the spiritual life of the people entrusted to him, and as a man capable of tender and lasting friendship. Through the whole there runs a vein of genuine and sometimes delicate humour, which comes to the front whenever the subject is not too serious or tragic to permit it.

'A fascinating story, as authentically indigenous to the mediæval scene as that of their sister aspirations, the Gothic cathedrals; with their privileges and charters, their vast confluence of students from the farthermost regions of the Western World; their inordinate dignity and fierce-held democracy, their turbulent, hard-drinking, riotous students; their bloody affrays, strikes, and secessions; and withal, their good hard learning and their soaring philosophies.' With these words Nathan Schachner introduces his account of *The Mediæval Universities* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net), and the story which follows is one which holds the attention of the reader to the last page. The popular picture of the Middle Ages as a period of passive submission to the Church, of unity in belief and practice, a picture which every student of history knows to be a fiction, is here illuminated with a weird variety of sidelights. We hear of professors being fined by their students for being absent or late, of statutes 'forbidding the Dean and Vice-Chancellor to give candidates private information of the questions in the coming examination,' of reluctant Rectors compelled to accept office, compelled also to redeem at exorbitant price every shred of clothing torn from off their back.

The universities to which the writer has devoted most attention are Paris, Bologna, and Oxford, but a general survey is given of the others. Many great and interesting personages come into view, from Abelard and Aquinas to Wycliffe and John Hus. The author traces the rise of the great European universities from the Cathedral Schools of the tenth and eleventh centuries, and their gradual development into republics of learning with power to treat on terms of equality with king and pope. He describes the great conflict between Realism and Nominalism, and the emergence of Scholasticism as the ancient wisdom made safe for Rome. It is a historical work of excellence, written in a pungent style, and with a salt of humour which should make it in the best sense popular.

We are glad to have in English the most considerable and illuminative of the late President T. G. Masaryk's philosophical writings—*Modern Man and Religion* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). It was the Great War and the subsequent years that made the name of Masaryk familiar throughout the world. His disinterested labours for his own small country in its difficult situation were well known and appreciated. Too few, however, realized that he was a man of thought no less than a man of action. At first this work seems to be antiquated. It was written some forty years ago; and in philosophy much water has flowed under the bridges since then. In politics, economics, and science tremendous changes have been witnessed. Yet perusal of the book will reveal that Masaryk has a message as vital to our own day as to his own prime. His main contention just is that without religion society will crumble and tumble into chaos; and surely the years have only added fresh testimony to the truth of that. He reviews the philosophical teachings of Hume, Kant, Comte, Spencer, and the Czech Smetana, showing how each of them is compelled to have recourse to religion or something akin to religion. Then turning to literature and examining Goethe and de Musset, he points to the ill consequences of revolt against God. The last part of the book is obviously only a sketch which the author had no opportunity to fill in and complete; but the whole is a book worth having and worth reading.

Democratic Leadership, by Principal A. Barratt Brown, M.A. (Allen & Unwin; 2s. 6d. net), is the Swarthmore Lecture for 1938. The writer is a firm believer in democracy and democratic leadership, but he seeks a more firm grasp of its principles and a more thorough application of them in practice. He finds in the constitution and proceedings of the Quaker Meeting a model of the kind of thing to be aimed at. There you have, not merely a counting of heads, and decision by a majority, but the putting of heads together in a friendly conference which aims at finding 'the sense of the meeting.' This method, which leaves no room for a triumphant majority and an embittered minority, is, in the writer's belief, the wise, right, and Christian way of democracy, and individuals, parties and nations should be educated and encouraged to follow it.

Duty and the Will of God, by the Rev. L. A. Garrard, B.D. (Blackwell; 12s. 6d. net), proves on reading to be, to a greater extent than the title would indicate, a history of Christian ethics, for to this the main part of the book is devoted. In the first and shorter section the writer examines the nature of the idea of duty with special reference to Kant's categorical imperative. He finds that 'our duty is always to set ourselves to do the act that we believe would have the effect of satisfying the greatest claim upon us.' Further analysis gives 'as an alternative statement of our categorical imperative the principle that we ought always to do the will of God.' The bulk of the book is devoted to a study of 'duty in Christian theology,' and a most valuable and illuminating study it is. A careful and scholarly review is given of the ethics of Jesus, preceded by a treatment of 'the Jewish conception of duty,' and followed by chapters on the contribution of St. Paul and the later New Testament writings. Thereafter the great Christian thinkers are discussed—Augustine, Aquinas, the Reformers, etc.—in so far as they treat of duty, and such special topics are dealt with as the double standard and the doctrine of conscience. Part III. of the book reviews 'the moral situation in Christian theology,' especially the doctrine of the Law of Nature in its relation to human institutions such as slavery, property, and government. The whole is a very thoughtful and valuable treatise, giving evidence on every page of wide reading, deep and incisive thinking, and sound judgment.

The Rev. Frank H. Ballard, M.A., in *The Return to Religion* (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net; and in paper covers, 1s. 6d. net), sets out from the Archbishop's call to the nation and deals in a popular fashion with the essentials. In the first part of the book he writes under the heading 'The Recall to Religion' and surveys successively The Return to God, The Return to a Christian Conception of Man, The Return to a Christian Way of Life, and The Return to the Priesthood of all Believers. The second part of the book was incited by Mr. H. G. Wells's rather silly remarks about the Bible at a recent conference, and considers The Bible as Literature, The People's Book, The Text Book of Human Liberty, and The Holy Book. These chapters were originally delivered as sermons and retain the homiletic form. But they are well worthy of a more permanent form. They are thoughtful, earnest, and persuasive presentations of urgent truth.

An earnest and intelligent attempt to deal with the condition of the unemployed in one of the 'Special Areas' has been made by the Rev. Kent White and a band of devoted helpers. A full and interesting account of the experiment is given in *The Hostel of the Good Shepherd* (Hodder & Stoughton; 1s. net). The book has for its aim an effort to remind complacent people of the terrible abuses that exist, in the hope that some possibilities of useful action may be suggested by Mr. White's experience. In successive chapters he tells the story of how a centre of activity, or rather activities, was established, and various attractive social and religious and even material enterprises were organized. The little book is important because of the originality and practical nature of the measures devised. There are both inspiration and guidance in these pages.

A series of addresses which the Rev. J. R. Ackroyd, B.D., delivered in Worthing Congregational Church have been published under the title *Christ Speaks to our Generation* (Independent Press; 1s. net). In five chapters we have Christ's message to the individual, the community, the Church, the nation, and the world. All are suggestive and pointed, and we are not surprised to read in the Rev. W. M. Girdwood's 'Introduction' that they were found impressive and a means of blessing.

A little book on *The Lord's Prayer*, by Mr. V. D. Davis, B.A. (Lindsey Press; 1s. net), is welcome. It contains an interpretation of the prayer, clause by clause, and also an address on 'The Offering of Prayer.' As the Lord's Prayer is repeated every Sunday by all of us, contains a summary of Christ's teaching, and is often misunderstood, or not understood at all, books of this kind have a clear usefulness.

The Rt. Rev. A. F. Winnington-Ingram, D.D., Bishop of London, has written a short book entitled *What a Layman Should Believe* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net). It is an appreciation and criticism of the recent Report on Doctrine in the Church of England. The 'appreciation' takes the form of an exposition, simple, clear, and untechnical, and enforced by many an illustrative instance, of certain fundamental Christian conceptions and affirmations. The 'criticism' is chiefly directed against the 'liberal' positions to which some of the signatories to the Report declared themselves to adhere; in particular, the denial of the Virgin Birth and the Physical Resurrection of Jesus. Dr. Ingram states the case for the conservative view on these doctrines, and is not slow to point out that the Archbishop of York among the signatories is on his side. It is a very readable book he gives us, and many will find it helpful.

The Rev. J. A. Broadbelt has followed up his book on 'Full Salvation' by a series of addresses published under the title of *The Burning Heart* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 1s. 6d. net). These addresses have the true Wesleyan ring about them, being full of fervour and striking the note of joy and victory. Some of them have already appeared in 'Joyful News,' and they will doubtless be welcomed by a wider circle of readers.

In his book, *The Stolen Sword* (Methuen; 6s. net), Principal L. P. Jacks makes what might at first sight seem to be merely an excursus into the region of detective fiction, and tells a thrilling story of a famous sword, with almost magical properties, said to have been originally used at the battle of Agincourt. It is a perilous possession, and the struggle to retain it, against the machinations of accomplished gangsters, provide many exciting incidents. The ultimate possessor regards the sword as a sacred hereditary trust, and so arranges matters that, after his death, no other human being shall acquire it. By reading between the lines of this tale an allegory might be discovered, hinting at the disastrous benefit of the possession of armaments; and the frequently repeated sentence, 'We are not pursuing a policy; we are keeping a promise,' would suggest the doctrine that militarism in all its phases is traditional rather than rational.

The Lamp of Epictetus, by Mr. Edward Jacomb (Methuen; 10s. 6d. net), does not profess to be a translation, but rather a paraphrase. Being convinced that a literal translation from the Greek would be dull and uninteresting to the modern reader, the author says, 'I have attempted to express Epictetus's thoughts as he might have expressed them were he lecturing in English to a class of young Englishmen at the present day; and I have deliberately used anachronisms, slang, and even Americanisms, when such seemed likely to beget a vividness which would otherwise be lacking.' There are obvious dangers in this method, but of the 'vividness' there can be no doubt. Take this example of 'advice to a boy on leaving school.' 'Well, my dear boy, here you are just going into the world for the first time. What an adventure! Now we want you to do something for us—to be, in fact, a kind of *scout* for us; to go out and see everything, and then come back and make a report. It won't be an easy job, you know. You'll want all your pluck to carry it through. But you won't be daunted by difficulties, will you? Difficulties prove the man.' The book will be found eminently readable and may do something to recommend Epictetus to modern readers. At the same time many will be apt to feel that the lectures, while containing good things, have a discouraging sameness about them, and that the argumentation is at times a somewhat barren logomachy. In the Stoic doctrine also, with its contempt for natural affection and all earthly comfort, there is a tone which we cannot but judge to be hard and affected.

In 1847 there landed in Bombay a young American missionary of the name of George Bowen. After a somewhat dilettante and adventurous youth he had been profoundly moved and changed in heart by a passionate love for a young lady whose memory, after her early death, he cherished to the end of his life. Devoting himself to mission work he felt impelled to accept no salary and to dedicate himself to a life of poverty. For forty years he lived in a little hut in the bazaar, sustaining his frail little body (he weighed only a hundred pounds) on native food and preaching daily in the streets of Bombay. Without being able to name a single convert he was revered by all as a Christian saint and a devotional writer of depth and insight. His memoir is at long length published under the title of *George Bowen of Bombay*, by Mr. Robert E. Speer (Missionary Review of the World, New York; $2.50). The get-up of the volume is not attractive. The page is crowded and is mainly occupied with extracts from letters and diaries in distressingly small print. But the patient reader with good eyesight will find here many spiritual gems.

A little book which should prove of great use to Sunday-school teachers has been issued by the National Sunday School Union, entitled *Twenty-Five Festival Orders of Service*, by Miss Bertha C. Krall (9d. net). It covers all types of special services. Besides the festivals of the Christian Year we have orders of service for harvest, flowers, cradle roll, promotion, teachers' re-dedication, etc. Full directions for each service are given, and the variety of suggestions offered shows that a great deal of thought and ingenuity has gone to the making up of this little book. It deserves a warm welcome.

Dr. Campbell Morgan seems to rival Spurgeon himself in the fertility of his Scriptural exposition. In the *Voices of Twelve Hebrew Prophets* (Pickering & Inglis; 2s. 6d. net) he deals with the so-called Minor Prophets, setting forth the spiritual message of each. Critical questions do not interest him. He merely mentions in passing, for example, that he does not doubt the historic accuracy of the story of Jonah. His aim throughout is to find in each case the divine word which the prophet was commissioned to deliver. After all, this is the thing that most matters, and preachers who intend to lecture on the Minor Prophets will find here much that is suggestive and helpful.

The Rev. Cyril Charles Richardson, B.A., S.T.M., Th.D., assistant Professor of Church History at Union Theological Seminary, has given us a good book in *The Church Through the Centuries* (Scribners; 8s. 6d. net). It is a history not of the Church but of the conception of the Church. In the frequent conferences as to the possibility of Christian reunion, the question 'What is the Church?' is of basal importance. Opinions have differed and do differ so much. Dr. Richardson in a series of well-informed and well-written chapters sets before us the main types of conception from the days of the apostles to our own; and endeavours to describe the historical background of each view. Thus we have accounts of the Church-conceptions of the early centuries, the age of Augustine, the Middle Ages, the Reformation Period, and the Modern Period It is all very interesting, informative, and suggestive. The conclusion is that 'we understand the meaning of the Church as the divine creation, the body of those whom God has called through His Son, and sent into the world to do His will. Because the truth of the Christian tradition is vital and not dead, it is embodied in a living community, which preserves, re-interprets, and hands it down to successive generations. In the Church Christianity is made alive.'

It is not generally realized that the Bible consists for the most part of traditions that were *spoken*, not written. Paul's letters were dictated and bear all the marks of this. The historical parts of the Old Testament were composed of stories originally recited round the camp fire. The prophetic works were uttered, not, in the first place at any rate, written. And to get the full value of the Bible it should be read aloud. This is part of the value of the Lessons in church. And therefore a book like *How to Read the Bible Aloud*, by the Rev. R. S. T. Haslehurst, B.D., Priest-Vicar of Chichester Cathedral (S.P.C.K.; 4s. net), is calculated to be of great service. One wondered how a whole book could be made on such a subject, but Mr. Haslehurst has no difficulty about that. He deals faithfully with the faults of clerical public speech, with the essentials of good reading, with voice production, with 'theatrical' and 'dramatic' reading, with wrong emphasis, with reading public prayers. It is all good, and all, alas! necessary. And the book ought to be read by all who propose to read the Bible aloud in public.

Recently many books have appeared containing prayers for young people, not all of them good.

A Service Book for Youth (S.P.C.K.; school edition 1s. 6d. net, teachers' edition 3s. 6d. net) is, however, different. It contains thirty-two complete services for school prayers, one page to each service. The plan is to begin with a psalm verse, then a reading, then a brief prayer, followed by a very short litany, a silent prayer and the Lord's Prayer. At the end of the book are supplementary readings from many sources—Marcus Aurelius, Faber, William Penn, St. Francis, the Gospels, and others. There is a sensible introduction on the conduct of school prayers. This is a book of great charm and value. It is also beautifully dressed and printed. No author or compiler is named, but the Archbishop of York writes a well-deserved commendatory foreword.

Jesus and the Common Man To-day, by the Rev. W. J. Wray, M.A. (Stockwell; 2s. 6d. net), is a vigorous and heartsome book. It deals in a dozen chapters with such topics as the Resources of Jesus, the Inspiration Jesus brings, Jesus and Youth, Jesus and Anxious Souls, Jesus Lord of Death. The writer appeals throughout for steadfast faith in Christ and for wholehearted devotion to His cause. Each chapter is concluded with an appropriate prayer.

Five Minutes to Twelve, by the Rev. Adolf Keller, D.D., LL.D. (S.C.M.; 2s. net), is the arresting title of a little book which intends to give 'a spiritual interpretation of the Oxford and Edinburgh Conferences.' None of the delegates to these oecumenical councils could have had a more profound insight into the religious and political state of Europe than Dr. Keller, and few may have had his intense spirituality. His reflections on the proceedings and his reaction to the whole situation make a contribution of quite peculiar value. Above all else he was impressed, on the one hand by the consciousness of unity in Christ in spite of theological differences, and on the other hand by the desperate need of the world which the gospel alone can meet. 'It is five minutes to twelve on the world's political dial! . . . This should not be a "scare-head" phrase, but a challenge to the Church of Christ to use what may be its last opportunity.'

The Rev. D. T. Niles, B.D., a young Christian leader of Ceylon, has written a very striking little book—*Sir, We Would See Jesus* (S.C.M.; 2s. net). It is, as the sub-title indicates, a study in evangelism. Its chapters deal with the plea for evangelism, its rationale, its practice, the evangelizing church, the indigenous church, and there is an appendix on methods and the special problem of the depressed classes. It is all very fresh and cheering and highly instructive. No missionary study circle should miss it, nor any individual who desires to know what Christianity is making of cultured Easterns, and what they are making of it.

Dr. Cyril H. Valentine, who recently gave us a most useful book on 'The Treatment of Moral and Emotional Difficulties,' has followed this up by an equally practical, if slighter, volume on *Psychology and Modern Life* (S.C.M.; 1s. 6d. net). The title is too large for the subject, which is really very much the same as that of his previous book. But this little volume is in its own way equally useful. It contains four addresses given as a course of lunch-hour talks at the Church of St. Edmund the King, Lombard Street, London. The audience consisted of busy city workers, and naturally Dr. Valentine was colloquial in his manner of speech. This does not lessen, but rather increases, the attractiveness of the talks. These deal with common neurotic weaknesses, and might well have been given from a pulpit. At any rate they may well suggest subjects for excellent practical discourses.

◆

The Early Church and Pacifism.

By the Reverend J. S. MacArthur, B.D., M.A., St. Michael's College, Llandaff.

Generally speaking, pre-Christian ethics did not regard war as evil in itself. This may be in large measure accounted for by the fact that each state was thought of as a universe in itself with its own religion and laws, the rights of other states hardly being considered at all, so that a system of international ethics scarcely came within the scope of the philosopher. It is true that Plato got beyond this idea to a certain extent and regarded civil wars, *i.e.*, wars between one Greek state and another, with horror as being fratricidal, but wars between Greeks and barbarians were regarded as inevitable, and there is little hint of the *inevitable* being modified by *unfortunately*.

With the advent of Christianity, however, a change was to be expected, since Christianity professed a universality to which no other religion had previously laid claim. Christ had died for the salvation of all men. Hence the adoption of Christianity seemed to involve the extension of principles previously binding the individual members of one state to the relations between state and state. All Christians were brothers, and so, if all the world were Christian, all wars would be fratricidal. And even though the whole world were not yet Christian it became questionable whether Christians had any right to kill those who, if not yet fellow-Christians, were at least fellow-men and potential fellow-Christians. This was the view of Tertullian who went the length of saying that there was nothing more entirely foreign to Christians than the affairs of State, for they acknowledged one all-embracing commonwealth—the world.[1]

In the Apostolic Age the question of the Christian attitude towards war seems scarcely to have arisen. The end of the world was thought to be imminent. Wars and rumours of wars were to be the precursors of the great cataclysm. They were not regarded as permanent factors in a future demanding the definition of an appropriate Christian attitude to them. Detachment from the question of war was at first rendered easier for the Church by the fact that in the Roman Empire at that time there was nothing like universal military conscription, and that in any case Jews, with whom Christians were in early times assimilated, were exempt from military service. Yet during this period we have to note one interesting incident. In the Jewish War of A.D. 66–70 the Christian community in Jerusalem in obedience to a vision left the city before it was besieged and settled at Pella in Peraea, thus taking no part in the war against Rome.[2] More than one reason for this action might be conjectured, but one possible explanation is that the Jerusalem Christians believed that the use of the sword was forbidden to them.

But if the advent of Christianity logically involved the supersession of Graeco-Roman ethics about war, how far did it involve the modification of the Old Testament view? The Old Testament was accepted by the Church, and it contained records of wars without condemnation of those who took part in them. It cannot be said that the Church regarded this as justifying wars in the age of the New Covenant, but it is probable that her veneration for the Old Testament hindered her total rejection of war, and the same may be said of the Messianic warfare recorded in the Apocalypse.[3]

It was towards the close of the second century that the problem of war began seriously to concern the Church. By that time the eschatological hope had waned. It could not be said either of the world or of the Roman Empire that the end was in sight. The faith was spreading and was finding recruits in all ranks and classes of society, including the army. Towards the end of this period we find Tertullian making his triumphant assertion:

'We are but of yesterday, and we have filled every place among you—cities, islands, fortresses, towns, market-places, the very camp.'[4]

In an earlier passage of the same treatise (c. 5) he alleges the testimony of Marcus Aurelius to the effect that relief from drought had been obtained by the prayers of Christians fighting in the imperial army. Yet it would be wrong to conclude that Tertullian regarded with approval the presence of Christians in the Roman army, for it is in his writings that we have some of the strongest assertions of pacifist opinion to be found in the Early Church. The suggestion has been made that while he was a Catholic he could write accepting the service of Christians in the army, as in the passage just quoted, but that when he became a Montanist his pacifist views hardened. In favour of this suggestion is the generally acknowledged late date of his *De Corona*, a work dealing expressly with the question of military service, but against it is the disagreement among scholars regarding the date of the *De Idololatria* in which one of his most uncompromising declarations of the pacifist position occurs.

---

[1] *Apologeticus*, 38.

[2] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, III. v. 3.

[3] Harnack, *Militia Christi*, 11 f.

[4] *Apologeticus*, 37.

The *De Corona* is concerned with the case of a soldier who refused to wear the military chaplet on a ceremonial occasion. On being challenged for his reason he declared that he had no liberty to wear the chaplet with the rest as he was a Christian. He was taken before the prefects and proceeded to discard his military uniform, giving up his sword 'which was not necessary either for the protection of our Lord.' Thence he was taken to prison to await 'the largess of Christ.' His action was criticized as a headstrong courting of martyrdom and as likely to cause trouble for his fellow-Christians in the army. Tertullian defends the soldier at great length, pointing out the associations of the military chaplet with pagan worship and the concessions to paganism involved in wearing it. After a good deal of rather pedantic reasoning about the significance of the chaplet he asks (c. 11) whether warfare is proper at all for Christians, and whether there is any sense in discussing the merely accidental when that on which it rests is to be condemned. Why, then, is warfare to be condemned? Even here the objections are not purely pacifist but are connected with the concessions to the pagan cultus involved in military service. Thus Tertullian asks whether it is lawful for a human oath to be superadded to one that is divine, and for a man to come under promise to another master after Christ. The force of this will be better appreciated if we remember that divine honours were paid to the emperor. Then comes the genuinely pacifist objection—can it be held lawful to make an occupation of the sword, when the Lord proclaims that he who uses the sword shall perish by the sword? Shall the son of peace take part in battle when it does not become him even to sue at law? Shall he apply the chain, and the prison, and the torture, and the punishment, who is not the avenger of his own wrongs?

So far he has been considering the choice of the military life as an occupation, and he seems to be in no doubt that a Christian who chose it would be doing wrong. But what of those who become Christians while serving in the army? Must they abandon military service? Tertullian admits that with them the case is different, and cites the instances of the soldiers who approached John the Baptist and were not refused, the centurion of whom Christ approved, and the centurion whom Peter instructed. With these Scriptural examples before him Tertullian cannot say that the soldier when he becomes a Christian is bound to throw away his arms, but we feel that that is what he would have liked to say, for the concession that the case is different does not amount to very much. He says that three choices lie before the soldier who becomes a Christian. He may abandon military service at once as many have done. Or else the Christian soldier may resort to unworthy subterfuges in order to avoid offending God (the allusion seems to be to the difficulty of avoiding participation in pagan worship). Or, lastly, 'for God the fate must be endured which a citizen-faith has been no less ready to accept.'

It is significant that the strongest declaration of pacifism to be found in Tertullian occurs in a treatise against idolatry where he says:[1]—

'But now inquiry is made about this point, whether a believer may turn himself unto military service, and whether the military may be admitted unto the faith, even the rank and file, or each inferior grade, to whom there is no necessity for taking part in sacrifices or capital punishment. There is no agreement between the divine and the human sacrament,[2] the standard of Christ and the standard of the devil, the camp of light and the camp of darkness. One soul cannot be due to two [lords]—God and Caesar. And yet Moses carried a rod, and Aaron wore a buckle, and John (Baptist) is girt with leather, and Joshua the son of Nun leads a line of march; and the People warred: if it pleases you to sport with the subject. But how will [a Christian man] war, nay, how will he serve even in peace, without a sword, which the Lord has taken away? For albeit soldiers had come unto John, and had received the formula of their rule; albeit, likewise, a centurion had believed; [still] the Lord afterward, in disarming Peter, unbelted every soldier. No dress is lawful among us, if assigned to any unlawful action.'

This affords evidence in support of the suggestion already noted that veneration for the

---

[1] *De Idololatria*, 19.

[2] The reference here is to the *sacramentum* or military oath of loyalty. It has been suggested that the circumstance that the same word was used in Latin both for the soldier's oath and for the Christian sacraments tended to prevent the Church as a whole from taking up a thorough-going pacifist position.

Old Testament made the Church hesitate to adopt absolute pacifism. But how much weight did Tertullian's arguments carry with the majority of Christians? Gibbon, referring to the *De Corona* passage, says that his suggestion of the expedient of deserting was not very proper to conciliate the favour of the emperor towards the Christian sect. That may well be true, and there were those who blamed the spread of Christianity for weakening the military spirit of the Roman Empire.

Typical of the kind of anti-imperialist pacifism on which such a charge might be based is the following passage from the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix (xxv. 4):—'Thus, whatever the Romans hold, cultivate, or possess, is the spoil won by their insolence: all their temples are made from the spoils of war, that is, from the ruin of cities, the plundering of gods, and the murder of priests. That is insult and mockery, to yield obedience to conquered divinities and, after conquering them, to worship them in their captivity. For to worship that which you have taken with your own hand is to show reverence for sacrilege, not for gods. Therefore, as often as the Romans triumphed, so often did they commit sacrilege.'

Nevertheless there is not much evidence beyond Tertullian's own statement that Christians deserted from the army in large numbers. In the cases where trouble arose the problem of conscience seems more often to have been concerned with the risk of making concessions to idolatry than with the objection to shedding blood. The question of the lawfulness for a Christian of serving in the Roman army seems to have been for most Christians theoretically separable from the more general one of the lawfulness for a Christian of bearing arms at all. For Tertullian it was not thus separable, though it may be noted that many of his arguments are more relevant to the particular question than to the general one.

M. E. Vacandard has collected a number of historical examples referring to this point.[1] One of the most instructive of these is that of Marinus, an officer serving in Palestine about 260. The fact that he was an officer shows that not all Christian soldiers were content with serving in the ranks of the army where the likelihood of having to take part in pagan worship was less. Marinus had obtained promotion by seniority, but a fellow-officer who was jealous denounced him to the authorities as being a Christian and therefore refusing to sacrifice to the emperors. Therefore according to the ancient laws there could be no high office for him in the army. Marinus, on being summoned before the tribunal, admitted that he was a Christian. He was given three hours in which to reflect on the consequences of his decision. The bishop of the place, Theotecne, hearing how things stood, took Marinus into church, and placing the Gospels and the soldier's sword side by side said, 'Choose.' Without hesitation Marinus laid his hand on the Gospels, and at the end of the three hours was put to death.[2]

Vacandard rightly observes that but for the denunciation of his jealous rival Marinus would have pursued his military career. He must have been able somehow to reconcile the obligations of the service with the scruples of his conscience, and in Vacandard's opinion there is every reason to believe that there was a tacit understanding between Church and State to allow Christian soldiers to fulfil their office without compromising their consciences.

Towards the end of the third century the persecution under Galerius and Diocletian revealed the presence of Christians in the army. If the State had previously winked at the non-participation of Christian soldiers in pagan rites, it was no longer willing to turn a blind eye, and soldiers in Diocletian's army were ordered to sacrifice on pain of dismissal.[3]

But with the conversion of Constantine the persecutions of the Church were to come to an end. How was the attitude of Christians towards military service affected? Tertullian had said that if Caesar became a Christian he would no longer be Caesar, but when Constantine became a Christian nothing was farther from his mind than to give up being emperor. Consideration of the military successes of some of his pro-Christian predecessors is thought to have counted for something in Constantine's adoption of Christianity, and the most generally accepted story of his conversion connects it with a night vision in which he was promised victory in battle under the sign of the Cross. Whatever may have been the sincerity of his motives the desire to acquire a powerful supernatural ally in the furtherance of his military and political aims probably weighed a good deal with him.

Under Constantine and his successors the Church for the most part found it possible to countenance what she was pleased to term just wars. Now that the Roman Empire had become Christian, and since it was against pagans and heretics that most of its wars were waged, little difficulty was experienced in justifying them. If for barbarians we substitute pagans and heretics, and for Greece the Roman Empire, we have a remarkably close analogy between the Platonic view of war and that of Christian Rome in the fourth century. Christianity was certainly a universal religion, but the Roman Empire so nearly included all civilization that its citizens were tempted, even though they were Christians, to regard Rome as the universe, and to look on her enemies as the enemies of God and humanity. Although there might be some hesitation about spreading the gospel by means of the sword, yet when Rome went to war her Christian subjects flocked loyally to her standards. Common honesty seemed to demand that some return should be made to the State for the benefits that the Church enjoyed at its hands.

---

[1] *Études de critique et d'histoire religieuse*, 2e série, 127 ff.

[2] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, vii. 15.

[3] Lactantius, *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, 10.

But had the Church any right to make a payment of this sort? If, as Tertullian had claimed, Christ had sheathed the swords of His followers, could they possibly be justified in drawing them again at the bidding of the State? Was the abandonment of pacifism one of the concessions made to human imperfection by Christianity when it became the State religion? The Church ought not, it may be argued, to have accepted State patronage so easily; she should have made no compromise when Constantine sought admission to her ranks. As Peter sheathed his sword at the bidding of Christ, so ought Constantine to have sheathed his at the bidding of Christ's ambassadors. In the event of his refusal would it not have been better for Christians to remain a persecuted minority with their divine patrimony intact?

But in spite of such pacifist utterances as those of Tertullian it is more than doubtful whether the Church did regard pacifism as part of her divine inheritance. The main objection to military service does not seem to have been the pacifist one, but the obligation to participate in pagan worship, which service in the Roman army, at least in its higher ranks, involved. With the conversion of Constantine such obligation was abolished, and we find the emperor reinstating Christian officers whom his predecessors had deprived of their military rank on account of their Christianity.

The Church has indeed been thought to have gone the length not only of renouncing but of actually denouncing pacifism. Evidence for this is adduced from the third canon of the Council of Arles held in 314, which appeared to enact that those who throw away their arms in time of peace are to be repelled from Communion.[1] But there are difficulties in this apparently obvious interpretation. What is the meaning of *in pace*? One suggestion is that as deserters in time of war would be punished by the military authorities the Church would be relieved of responsibility in dealing with them. Another interpretation is that *in pace* refers to the recently established peace between Church and State, and that the canon is in effect one of the terms of the concordat. Against both these interpretations is the lack of evidence for the application of such a rule and even the existence of evidence that precisely such action as these interpretations condemn was taken without incurring ecclesiastical censure. Dr. C. J. Cadoux[2] thinks that the canon does not refer to desertion from the army at all but is a prohibition of participation in the gladiatorial games. The phrase *qui arma projiciunt in pace* should then be translated not *those who throw away their arms in time of peace*, but *those who discharge weapons in time of peace* (*i.e.*, when there is no need to use weapons, thus implying the legitimacy of military service but making no pronouncement about desertion). The probability of this interpretation is strengthened by the fact that the following canon deals with charioteers and actors.

What traces of pacifism are to be found in the Church after the conversion of Constantine? The twelfth canon of the Council of Nicaea orders that 'as many as had been called by grace, and had at first displayed their zeal, but who, having cast aside their military girdles, afterwards returned, like dogs, to their own vomit (so that some spent money and by means of gifts regained their military stations)' were to be subjected to a penance of thirteen years' duration, but Vacandard points out[3] that this refers only to soldiers who had been deprived of their rank on account of their Christianity, but who had betrayed their faith by resuming service under Licinius, their action being tantamount to apostasy.

More definite indications of pacifism are to be found in various Church-Orders dealing with conditions of church membership and dating from the fourth century. The general attitude of these Church-Orders is not one of total condemnation of the military life for Christians, that is, if a soldier becomes a Christian he is not obliged to leave the army, but he must not shed blood. Nor may a Christian become a soldier. But the importance of this evidence is diminished by the obscurity of the literary history of these Church-Orders and uncertainty regarding the extent to which they were obeyed in the Church.[1]

---

[1] *De his qui arma projiciunt in pace, placuit abstineri eos a communione.*

[2] *The Early Church and the World*, 588 n.

[3] *Études de critique et d'histoire religieuse* 2e série, 159 n.

Whatever the authority of such documents may have been, there are indications that individual consciences were not easy about the question of military service. In 341 Martin, afterwards Bishop of Tours, demanded to be released from the army after he had received baptism. The occasion of the request was unfortunate as it was on the eve of battle, and he was naturally accused of cowardice when he said to the Emperor Constans, 'I am a soldier of Christ; I am not allowed to fight.' In order to prove that he was not actuated by fear he offered to place himself in the front line of battle unarmed, but instead he was placed under arrest. The enemy, however, sued for peace before the battle could take place, and Martin obtained his discharge from the army. Some years later Victricius, afterwards Bishop of Rouen, acted similarly. He was beaten and condemned to death, but the sentence was not carried out. This incident may be the less significant for having taken place during the reign of Julian the Apostate, though we have it on the authority of St. Augustine,[2] that Christian soldiers served under Julian, refusing, however, to take part in idolatrous worship.

A short time before the sack of Rome a pagan, Volusianus by name, attempted to prove the incompatibility of Christianity with good citizenship by citing Christ's command to turn the other cheek to the smiter. On the matter being reported to St. Augustine by his friend Marcellinus the saint replied that Christianity did not oppose the waging of a just war in the cause of humanity, and mentioned the fact that Christ Himself did not command the disarming of those soldiers who approached Him. The views expressed in his letter to Marcellinus he afterwards developed in his great work *De Civitate Dei*, where he also strengthened the faith of those who had identified Christianity so closely with the Roman Empire that they had almost come to believe that their religion as well as their city was doomed. The *Civitas Dei*, he insists, is immeasurably greater than any earthly city, and the *Pax Dei* far more comprehensive than any earthly peace, but the way thither lies through the rising and falling of many cities and the waging of many wars. Until these ideals are attained, and indeed in order to attain them, the Christian must be a patriot and a soldier.

Such was the non-pacifist way of thinking that came to prevail in the Church. The brief survey of pacifist tendencies that we have here undertaken indicates that the Church of the first three centuries had not made up her mind on the Christian attitude towards war. That being the case it would hardly be correct to say that the abandonment of pacifism was part of the price paid by the Church for imperial patronage; but it is possible to argue that in this matter the Church's mind was made up for her rather by the pressure of circumstances than by the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

Nevertheless the Church's horror of bloodshed found expression in the exemption of her clergy from military service. The emperors, in making this concession, were merely according to the Christian clergy the same privilege that had been granted to pagan priests. It is interesting to remember that Origen, writing in the middle of the third century, had pointed out that pagan priests enjoyed this exemption and had claimed it for Christians on the ground that all Christians were priests. That the concession which Origen demanded for the universal priesthood of all Christians should in fact have been granted only to the ordained priesthood indicates the progress that the 'double standard' conception of the Christian life was making in the Church, and that in this particular it involved a direct borrowing from paganism is not without significance.

---

[1] For a useful presentation and discussion of this evidence, cf. C. J. Cadoux, *The Early Church and the World*, 430–433, 590.

[2] *In Psalm*, cxxiv.

Calvin: A Character Sketch.

By the Reverend A. Mitchell Hunter, D.Litt., F.R.S.E., Edinburgh.

For good or evil the system of theology identified with John Calvin has penetrated into all quarters of the world, dominating the thought and directing the energies of millions amongst the most progressive people on earth—this in spite of having been the target of much vitriolic and frequently ill-informed censures. Every such system is inevitably shot through with the personality of its author, and an adequate knowledge of the man Calvin himself is a prime necessity for a just evaluation of his teaching.

The first mention of Calvin in the records of Geneva describes him as 'iste Gallus,' that Frenchman. Nationality explains much, and he is no exception. He was the distillation or incarnation of the peculiar genius of the stock from which he sprang. Picardy, his native province, was the nursery of a race to which liberty was as the breath of life, which held tyranny in abhorrence and strove to assert emancipation from all that shackles mind or soul. 'The Picards,' says Lindsay, 'combined in a singular way fervent enthusiasm with cold tenacity of purpose.' The ancestors of Calvin had been seamen or, at least, boatmen for generations on the river Oise in the north of France, and their calling seems to have bred in them a restless spirit of independence and adventure which strongly marked the family to which he belonged.

Calvin's father exercised an exacting supervision over his family. 'I had a severe father,' says Calvin, 'and I rejoice at it as the source of any virtues I possess.' Calvin's mother, Jeanne le Franc, daughter of a well-to-do innkeeper, was equally distinguished for her beauty of feature and her beauty of soul. John was the second of three brothers, all of whom inherited a disposition to nonconformity. All three started life as *curés* in the cathedral. John had the tonsure but was never in actual orders.

Both pen and brush pictures make us familiar with Calvin's appearance. The earliest of these, executed when he was twenty-five, shows the unmistakable face of the hard student, with the heavy pouched eyes of one who pores incessantly over books, and the lean cadaverous features that betray the physical derangements of which he so soon became the victim. His hair was originally black, but turned white before he was forty. His eyes were his most striking feature, quick in their movements, burning with the spirit that flamed within, charged with a searching and penetrating power felt by all who came beneath their glance or scrutiny, and with a look of resolution which was true to the soul of the man. His emaciated frame latterly became little more than a rickle of bones and nerves. Always the personification of neatness and becomingness in dress, he could not suffer a speck of dust on his clothes when he sallied from his house to take his place in the pulpit. Uncleanliness and untidiness were as distasteful to him as ostentatious display.

Calvin was a sore sufferer practically all his working days, and due allowance for this must be made in accounting for some of his salient characteristics. The studious habits, the unsparing demands he made upon his health and strength along with the insanitary and harsh conditions of life in more than one of the various colleges he attended, brought on digestive troubles which increased in severity and induced serious complications, latterly both arthritic and tubercular. A high-strung temperament aggravated his ailments. When angered or anxious, he tells in a letter, he was apt to eat to excess and devour his meat more eagerly than he should. Latterly, he limited his meals to one a day. He was miserably handicapped and often quite crippled by overmastering headaches, sometimes lasting for three or four days, which were frequently so violent that he would lose consciousness. But such was the indomitable spirit of the man that he would defy the excruciating pain and preach with his usual force during an attack.

Calvin worked with such incessant industry and intense application that he gave himself little chance to regain the health so early lost. His literary output was prodigious. In addition to what survives, there is evidence that whole works disappeared during their transmission to friends for review. Add to these the sheaves of letters destroyed or lost by their recipients which must have amounted to many more than those preserved. Not a few of his letters are of the nature and length of treatises. He wrote with that unfailing uniform rapidity which reminds one of the uncanny swiftness with which Sir Walter Scott covered sheet after sheet. The elaborate answer to Cardinal Sadoleto (extending to forty-four quarto pages in the English translation) was thrown off in one day, and the pamphlet against Westphal in three days. Secretaries had to be employed to enable him to keep pace with the demands upon his pen, and their post was no sinecure. They had need of the shorthand then in use. One of them writes that he was often overcome with admiration for the impetuosity and rush of the singular eloquence that poured from Calvin's lips.

Like Talleyrand, Napoleon, and other supermen, he was able to do with little sleep, often not more than four hours. After working far into the night, fighting against drowsiness, he would be awake at dawn, conning over, before rising, the studies of the previous day. During the composition of the *Institutes*, according to Du Raimond, his Roman Catholic biographer, he frequently passed whole nights without sleeping, as he did whole days without eating. He was ever commanded by a profound and urgent sense of responsibility. When latterly life was almost an incessant pain, his friends urged him to give up at least dictating and writing, 'Would you that the Lord should find me idle when He comes?' was the answer of a man more relentless to himself than to any other. He left no work half-done. Death did not surprise him with loose ends in his weary fingers.

Seldom did he have leisure to revise his writings before they went to the press. Interruptions to the work of composition were all too common, but fortunately he possessed the faculty of resuming where he left off as though there had been no break in the steady flow of his thought. Only once was a manuscript begun which he failed to complete through getting bogged by the way. His treatise on *Offences* required to be restarted several times, and it was not till four years after its inception that he recaptured the right mood for its completion.

Short intervals of mild recreation he did allow himself. Nothing delighted this bogey man of popular belief more than to relax in play with children. A baby's smile was to him a benediction, and not seldom he would practice the cunning art of luring one to the bright surface of understanding infant eyes. One of his pleasures was the setting up of a Christmas tree in his own house. It was this trait that drew his successor Beza to him at the age of twelve. In one of his sermons Calvin speaks of tennis balls quite intelligently, even of cards he knew enough to be aware of the value of trumps. His own favourite pastime was a game resembling billiards called Le Clef, which he would play of an evening at one of the clubs organized by himself in Geneva to supply the place of the demoralizing taverns.

Calvin was possessed of a naturally hot and choleric temper, only too explosive, a temper with a hair-trigger. An extreme sensitiveness, morbid in its touchiness, increased his vulnerability to slights. If the vehemence of his reproaches sometimes surprised his friends who had unwittingly offended, he often writhed under the revilings of his enemies. It galled him bitterly to think that he should be pilloried for scorn or hatred as a pestilent heretic in market-places or at street corners or dinner-parties.

Naturally of a timid disposition and neurotic temperament, he possessed in a high degree the moral courage which could compel him to do what his nature instinctively shrank from. This courage was without doubt sustained by his keen and constant sense of being predestined to a great and sacred vocation which assured him of divine protection against all perils till his appointed work was done. In this he proved how doctrine might be the inspiring and driving power of a life.

Calvin was one of those men of immense vitality who cannot rest in any position save one of dominance. From the beginning of his career he was conceded the first place in all companies as by natural right. Within a year after his conversion he was practically head of the evangelical party. Everywhere men bowed to his pre-eminent power, transcendent abilities and masterful force of sanctified character. To secure his services the authorities of Geneva were willing to submit to any conditions he liked to impose. The law might enact that a magistrate should preside over the Genevan consistory or presbytery, but sixteen years after his death, its members recorded that he had exercised the presidency all his life without having been in any way expressly elected to it, and every one endorsed his assumption of the position with satisfaction and pleasure.

All sorts of people consulted him, from the highest to the lowest in the social scale and about all kinds of things. So deservedly trusted was his far-seeing and penetrating sagacity that with the Reformed Churches everywhere his word was practically law. Even his enemies gave reluctant witness to his natural greatness. Men of the Romish faith, it was said, had calculated his horoscope and discovered that 'the honour of the Roman pontificate was promised Calvin at his birth.' Pope of Geneva, as he was called, or Pope at Rome—he was bound to become either one or the other!

His naturally autocratic disposition, fomented by the deference paid to him, was strengthened by his aristocratic proclivities, perhaps due in some degree to the circumstances of his early education. In his correspondence with princes and nobles he expresses himself mostly as though speaking to his peers, which might indicate his democratic principles as well as his aristocratic disposition. But he was always most at home with men and women of noble birth or high social position.

Exile as he was from his native land for the greater part of his early life, Calvin's mother-tongue may be said to have been rather Latin than French, Latin being the language of international intercourse in educated circles. When all his energies were latterly bent towards propagating and popularizing the Reformed faith, he set himself to acquire such a command of the French tongue as would make it the obedient servant of his purpose. Such a mastery did he gain of its rich resources, and so did he purify it from its barbarous elements, that his writings are credited with having given an incomparably influential impulse and direction to that development which has resulted in making French a tongue in which eloquence finds its most perfect instrument and song its most charming expression.

Calvin had command of wit of a sort, though it could scarcely be called light-footed, and occasionally was elephantine. Of sarcasm that verged upon the vitriolic, irony that scathed, raillery that scintillated, he was a master. His tongue, when irate or bitter, took on an edge and a sting which left a weal on its victim. In his more passionate outbursts he often employs a guillotine to decapitate a fly, and indulges in the unrestrained rudeness and even insolence which was then accepted as part of the genial frankness of controversy. Calvin was a brilliant conversationalist when in good spirits, bubbling over at times with jests and even puns till the company held its sides with laughter. He would smile indulgently while all the clash of the town poured itself out round his table, and chuckle as heartily as any over the hot water into which the eccentric Bonnivard, known to romantic history as the Prisoner of Chillon, had got himself through taking for his second wife the widow of two husbands. We may well regret that no records of his table talk remain to let us see the man in undress mufti.

Calvin's letters, of which over four thousand have been published, provide a mine of valuable material for the elucidation of his thought and the illustration of contemporary history. As the recognized soul and brain of the Reform movement that rapidly spread into all parts of Europe, his correspondents include many of the crowned heads and the leading statesmen of countries to which the yoke of Rome had become galling. From his Genevan watch-tower Calvin kept an eager and vigilant outlook upon current events, always regarded in their bearing upon the welfare of the infant Protestant Church. His study was a whispering gallery of the world. Europe was in a ferment of disorder. Calvin heard the clash of arms ring out at one time or another in almost every one of its nations. International politics was a tangled skein. Royal ambitions, national jealousies, religious animosities, all played their part then as now, in controlling and directing policies, and Calvin's letters mirror the whole kaleidoscopic business. Sagacious commentaries and shrewd forecasts accompany his references and reports. That he played the part of political prophet more successfully than most aspirants, was due not merely to his possession of the statesman's grasp and instinct of prevision, but to his kinship with the race of Isaiah and Jeremiah who saw far and true because they were given something of the foresight of God Himself.

Calvin was consulted not only on questions in theology and politics. Intellectual snobbishness was not one of his faults. The pebbles at his feet were in their own way as interesting and important as the stars in the heavens. His interest is invoked for an invention in connexion with stoves, and again about a device for the improvement of chimneys. He reviews the qualifications of various damsels to be the wife of a friend. Ministers, who have any money to spare, should entrust it, in his opinion, to an honourable man of business and contentedly accept such a return as might justify them in expecting the divine blessing on its use.

There were no letters into which Calvin so put his whole soul as those of consolation. If he lacked the mind of Christ in some things, his heart was like his Master's, at least, in being deeply moved by his fellows' infirmities, sorrows, and trials. Many of the griefs which cried to him from afar must have touched him with a peculiar poignancy, for he could not but recognize that fidelity to his own leadership had brought them upon the sufferers. 'Six hundred martyrs,' he once said, 'will stand before God as advocates in defence of my doctrine.' Many last letters from those about to die for their faith plunged him into a woe that was touched with a not ignoble pride. He agonized in their agony. 'If Calvin made martyrs,' says Michelet, 'they also made him one.'

Calvin was no narrow-minded theologian. He won his spurs as a humanist, and never ceased to be one. Cicero continued to sit at the busy looms of his brain along with Augustine, and Plautus and Terence helped to spin his web of thought along with the Christian Fathers. The extent of his classical learning may be gauged from the fact that in his first publication, an edition of Seneca's *De Clementia,* he quotes from no less than fifty-six Latin and twenty-two Greek classical authors, referring to thirty-three works of Cicero, all the works of the fragrant poet Horace, as also of Virgil and Ovid, five plays of Terence, the epics of Homer, half a dozen of the principal works of Aristotle, and four of Plato and of Plutarch. There is a tradition of doubtful authenticity that he read through Cicero once a year.

But of course it was to the study of Christian authors that Calvin primarily devoted himself when once launched upon his chosen career. There are few of the patristic classics to which he does not make reference with an obvious mastery of their teaching and an enviable facility of apt quotation. In a single paragraph of the Preface to the *Institutes,* quotations are made from Aetius, Ambrosius, Spiridion, Augustine, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Pope Callixtus, Pope Gelasius, Cyprian, and Paphnutius. Add to all this rich and varied equipment his wide and accurate knowledge, gained at the universities of Paris and Orleans while qualifying for the legal career destined for him by his father as 'a means of arriving at wealth and honour.' Calvin was indeed as accomplished a lawyer as he was a divine, like the great builders of the Western Church, Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustine, and Gregory the Great. He brought the penetrating acumen and judicial balance of a mind trained in the law's subtleties both to the review of the Mosaic Code, the organization of the infant Reformed Church, and the reconstruction of the economy of the Genevan State. The compilation of a new legal code for the city, at first entrusted to a committee of professional lawyers, was, on their failure to achieve it, transferred to Calvin, who successfully accomplished the responsible task single-handed within a fortnight. Many delicate political negotiations and arbitrations were confided to his sagacity. Calvin would have made an outstanding statesman, had his destiny led him into that precarious and tortuous path.

It may be not without interest to indicate the salary enjoyed by this amazing man. His stipend at Geneva amounted to five hundred florins, along with a house, twelve measures of wheat, and two casks of wine. Doumergue estimates this sum as equivalent to one hundred and sixty pounds (in pre-war value). The expense for the postages of his prodigious correspondence, secretaries, journeys, and other items must have been formidable. His hospitality was known all over Europe, a correspondent affirms, and was taken full advantage of. Strangers from all quarters offered themselves as his guests, and were received with a courteous and willing welcome as of one whose means were as unlimited as his goodwill.

The Council of Geneva recognized at intervals that they must supplement his insufficient means, and the nature of their gifts forms a pathetic revelation. Twice he was presented with a coat, the second one suitable for winter; at another time with a barrel of wine, a liquor much and often in those days disastrously used, as in his case, as a medicine; once ten crowns were bestowed to meet the expenses of an illness. His sturdy independence would not allow him to accept what savoured of sheer charity. In his last months when the Council desired to augment his meagre salary by twenty-five crowns, twice over he declined the money because his scrupulous sense of honour forbade him to take more than he was legally entitled to, all the more that he was unable to do the work for which he was paid.

His books, of course, provided a varying addition to his income, but for a considerable time their sale was so small that little or no profit was made. At his death his total estate amounted to about four hundred pounds, decisive proof of the unworldliness of a man who had occupied a position of incomparable influence and power, besides publishing a library of books whose circulation in the aggregate was very large. Pope Pius IV., on hearing of Calvin's death, said, 'What made the strength of this heretic was that money was nothing to him.'

Calvin's home life was of the most frugal kind. He loved simplicity in food, clothing, and furnishings. An inventory of his house furniture exists in the registers of Geneva from which it appears that its cost amounted to from thirty-five to forty pounds. When Cardinal Sadoleto went incognito to visit him, he was astonished to be directed to a small tenement and to find the door opened at his knock by Calvin himself, dressed very simply. On his expressing surprise, the Reformer made the dignified answer that he did not look to enrich himself and to become great in the world, but to glorify God and to defend His truth. These forthright words are self-revealing.

Whatever sway Calvin exercised over the minds of men by sheer intellectual power, the ultimate secret of his commanding influence was his tremendous moral enthusiasm flaming from a white-hot spiritual conviction. Truth was his pole-star, and righteousness his compass. With unswerving, uncompromising, and jealous devotion to both, he held on his resolute way, undaunted by threats, undiscouraged by failure, sure that *magna est veritas et prævalet*. Calvin was possessed by the constant sense of a great life's task divinely set him which he must and would accomplish because God was with him. A saying of his was *amanti nihil arduum*, 'to one who loves nothing is hard.' His faith never fell victim to such agonized tremblings of heart or questionings of soul as often plunged Luther into the depths. His heart was wholly given to God, and the Divine Providence in which he utterly trusted was to him the great reality.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Mixture.

By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Lisbon.

'Things that accompany salvation.'—Heb 6⁹.

Lewis Carroll wrote *Alice in Wonderland*, and we have all read that; but he wrote also a lot of letters to his little friends, and here is a very pleasant bit from one of them. He is writing to a little girl who had asked him what he would like for his birthday. 'Well,' he says, 'I like very much indeed a little mustard with a bit of beef spread under it; and I like brown sugar—only it should have some apple-pudding mixed with it to keep it from being too sweet; but what I like best of all is salt with some soup poured over it. The use of soup is to hinder the salt from being too dry and it helps to melt it. And I like two or three handfuls of hair—only they should have a little girl's head beneath them to grow on, or else, whenever you open the door, they get blown all over the room, and then they get lost, you know.'

That is very quaint and whimsical, but it is more than that: it has truth in it that is good not only for Lewis Carroll's birthday, but for every day in the life of everybody.

Mustard and sugar and salt and curly hair are all good things, but they need to be mixed with other things. A mouthful of mustard is most unpleasant and sets the tears pouring down. A spoonful of salt will possibly make you violently sick. Sugar alone you soon tire of. And curly hair without the head it belongs to is simply good for nothing at all.

But, on the other hand, beef without mustard is dull; apple pudding without sugar is insipid; soup without salt is tasteless; and a girl's head without hair is just a horrid grotesque. The beef and the mustard, the pudding and the sugar, the salt and the soup, the head and the hair need each other; and any of them alone is incomplete.

Now instead of thinking of beef and pudding and soup and young heads, think of Life itself. Life needs something to give it zest and sweetness and wholesomeness and grace. I say what it needs is Religion, for that is just what the religion of Jesus Christ does. It should be something which touches all our life in every bit of it. It is not something which can be kept apart from life; and so the Bible talks not only about salvation but about 'the things which accompany salvation,' just as beef and pudding, soup and little heads, accompany mustard and sugar and salt and curly hair.

People have tried to be religious by getting away from life, refusing marriage and family life and home, refusing human friendship, trying to be heavenly by denying the earthly, trying to be divine by ceasing to be human. They failed, of course. They didn't become divine but just inhuman. They didn't get nearer to Christ by keeping away from their fellow-men. Their religion was harsh and hot as a mouthful of mustard; bitter as a spoonful of salt; bald and unsightly as a head without hair. They forgot 'the things which accompany salvation.'

The only proof of salvation is in the things that accompany it. Salvation has come to any one if his faith in Jesus Christ and his love for Him are making him daily a better son, a better brother, a better father, a better friend, more kind and patient and cheerful in all the ways of life. Religion out of touch with life goes bad; it is repellent and unlovely. It has got to be mixed in with everything else. It's no use alone, just as salt and mustard and sugar are unpleasant by themselves alone, and curls have no beauty without the head that they are meant to adorn. And life without religion is equally an incomplete thing. People don't see that; but it is true.

Think of the life of Jesus. How full of zest it was! You can't imagine Him finding anybody dull, or thinking life in quiet little Nazareth savourless and slow. What a sweetness was through all His life. How crowned it was with grace and beauty! How few lives are like His! And why? Just for the want of what gave these qualities to His life—real religion.

Jesus didn't talk about mustard and sugar and curly hair, but He did talk about salt. He said His followers were to be like salt in the world. He told them to have salt in themselves; and when He said that He was just saying what Lewis Carroll meant when he said salt needed soup poured over it. A boy once wrote in an essay on salt, 'Salt is what makes porridge nasty *if you don't put any in*!' Religion is the salt of life; the thing that keeps it wholesome, preserves it from going bad; it gives sweetness, as sugar does; it gives zest, as mustard does; it crowns it with grace and winsomeness.

Your doctor writes a prescription for you: it states quantities of different things and ends by saying in Latin, 'Mix together.' It comes back from the chemist in a bottle labelled 'The Mixture,' and with the direction, 'Shake the bottle before taking.'

I will give you a prescription for a happy life. Here it is: 'Work, play, friendship, home, school, and the religion of Jesus Christ. Mix and shake well together.'

So religion will permeate life, and life will be crowned by religion and the two will be one, as they were in the Lord Jesus Christ.

Flying the Flag.

By the Reverend Chas. M. Hepburn, B.D.,
Moulin, Pitlochry.

'Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.'—Jn 15^{13}.

I want to start by telling a story of a wonderful deed which was done in China some weeks ago. Although worthy of the Victoria Cross it occupied only a very small corner of the newspaper. It concerned a missionary, Dr. Wyatt by name. Along with three friends Dr. Wyatt was motoring in the province of Shansi, where a terrible war is going on, when quite unexpectedly they were fired at. A bullet smashed the driver's wrist and the car stopped. Dr. Wyatt jumped out at once, seized a Union Jack which was on the car, and vigorously waved it at the attackers. In spite of that the shooting continued. One lady in the car was shot, whereupon the other lady and gentleman sprang out and sought refuge underneath it. But not so Dr. Wyatt. Quickly he hoisted the wounded Chinese driver on his back, staggered across the bullet-swept road, and was jumping into a ditch when he was shot, but with very great bravery went on waving his Union Jack until he died. I may add that when the Chinese sharpshooters realized their mistake and that the motorists were friends, not foes, they expressed real sorrow, and did all they could to make amends.

I think now that good man's gallantry may teach us two things. On the one hand this, that Dr. Wyatt kept the flag of his country flying. So every true citizen will, like him, not want to lower his country's flag, which isn't merely a scrap of cloth, but a symbol of whatever ideals one's country stands for. A tale is told of a sturdy old admiral, Admiral Duncan, who was born near Dundee, that he chose to do battle with his enemy's ships in shallow water, because, said he, should his ship go down the top of the mast with the flag flying would still be showing. So at no time and in no fashion should we do anything to disgrace the flag or the reputation of our country. See to it that like both these brave men you by your courage and your loyalty keep the flag of your country flying.

Ah, but Dr. Wyatt on the other hand did something more, something even better, for he didn't just keep his country's flag flying, but by his glorious and unselfish action upheld the flag of Jesus Christ. Our Saviour said, 'Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.' And here was a heroic Christian man who laid down his, not for any much-loved friend, but for a poor Chinaman, whom very few would have tried to succour. Such wondrous self-sacrifice truly was flying the Saviour's flag. Other persons, one is glad to think, are doing that, too, in various ways. One German pastor is in prison simply because he has dared to say, 'We must obey God rather than men.' Shall we try to be as fearless for Christ, and with stout hearts unfurl His flag? Shall we dare to say this . . .

I'm not asham'd to own my Lord,
  or to defend his cause,
Maintain the glory of his cross,
  and honour all his laws.

Boys and girls, in doing that you will be keeping the flag of your Saviour flying.

The Christian Year.

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Beginning of Wisdom.

'The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.'—Pr 9¹⁰.

Proverbs forms part of what is known as the Wisdom Literature of the Hebrews, because of the stress it lays upon the worth of wisdom: 'Wisdom is the principal thing,' 'With all thy getting, get wisdom,' such are the exhortations constantly addressed to the reader.

What is this wisdom? let us ask first of all, so as to make sure of our bearings. Is it a kind of secret doctrine about the nature of God, speculations concerning the universe or the human soul, glimpses into hidden mysteries or the final consummation of the ages? No, there is nothing mystical or visionary in these chapters at all. The Hebrew mind is nothing if not concrete; just as Jesus Christ threw all His principles into story form—because there is nothing so 'telling,' in the true sense of the term, as a story—so, for example, where we should say 'Union is strength,' it comes natural to the Hebrew to express the same idea in the phrase, 'With two dogs they killed a lion.' Instead of an abstract notion there is a vivid picture—and it sticks: one sees the two dogs getting the fierce lion under by a concerted attack, whereas, singly, they would have been no match at all for the huge brute.

So in the present case, the 'wisdom' of the Book of Proverbs is no speculative affair, but practical to a degree. The Book of Proverbs drives at practice all the way. Not only so, but its exhortations and reflections come straight home to men; they appeal to the large unchanging factor in our composition. If you want to feel how essentially identical human nature twenty-five centuries ago was with the human nature of to-day, in spite of all the dizzy rush of inventions and the rest, let us read the Book of Proverbs, and see if it does not find us.

We can go to these ancient deliverances on the wisdom of life, and put our questions: On what terms is life to be lived? In what way is the maximum of personal happiness to be extracted from it? Is the highest wisdom a careful regard to one's own interests? Or again, may not the true philosophy be this, which we find expressed in one of the Apocryphal books: 'Our allotted time is the passing of a shadow, and there is no putting back of our end. Come, therefore, and let us enjoy the good things that now are. Let us crown ourselves with rosebuds ere they be withered, because this is our portion and our end is this.' Alas, this materialistic philosophy has been tried again and again, and always failed, always ended upon a note of despair. Live as though the world held no higher content than material gain or material pleasure, and we are bound to find it a woefully unsatisfactory place; try to minister to our own egoism, and though we be the most successful egoists, we are bound to finish with the disgusted confession of Ecclesiastes, declaring all things vanity and striving after wind.

No, but the principal thing for those who would make a success of life is wisdom, and that not in the sense of mere worldly prudence, but a recognition of the true basis of our individual existence and the order of the world; and the very beginning of wisdom, we read, the first condition of living aright, is the fear of God.

We do not hear so much of the fear of God nowadays as was customary in former generations. Earlier generations yielded more easily to theological terrorism. And then we also feel, or at least most modern people feel, that fear is by no means a high motive. If the fear of God signified only the terror of punishment and Divine vengeance, such a motive might restrain a man from this and that form of wickedness, but one would not call that even the beginning of wisdom.

But there is a true fear of God, which is quite a different emotion. It is a holy awe, a feeling that all this wondrous universe is the manifestation of infinite Purpose, and that in all this scene of ordered splendour we, too, have our place, with this difference, which exalts us above stars and suns, that it lies with us to fill our part well and creditably if we will. We are called to be fellow-workers with God, but not as bond-slaves. Such a consciousness has nothing in common with terror or cowardice: it is, on the contrary, fraught with a new sense of confidence, if also necessarily a new sense of responsibility. This fear of God, or awe of God, gives meaning and content to life.

Let us see how it affects us and operates on us in relation to the world, in our relations to others, and in relation to ourselves.

And first, *in relation to the world*. Apart from belief in God, the very vastness of the universe is enough to give one at times a feeling of frightened forlornness. But once the sense of God's presence in it all and over all makes itself felt, our dread gives place to confidence. If this is God's universe, then it is friendly to God's children; its forces ask to be used for our benefit, its secrets wait to be discovered, its resources are ours if we will set ourselves to develop them; yes, its very difficulties are intended to test and brace us, to challenge us and make us stronger. That is the true attitude towards the world—to regard it as the scene of Divine opportunity, of Divine discipline—and the man or woman who does so regard it, so uses as not abusing it, is the one who will achieve the truest success and know the highest joy. No atheistic or materialistic view of the world can give us that assurance, can supply that dynamic; that is why the sense of God's overruling Mind and Might is the beginning of wisdom.

And the same holds true *in regard to our relations to each other*. We begin to be wise when we realize that the moral, like the physical, universe is held together by an august and inviolable law which respects its respecters, and breaks its breakers. It is of God's ordinance. 'He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?' When men ruthlessly exploit their fellow-creatures, coin the misery of the economically helpless into gold, shall we not say in plain terms that what is lacking in their hearts is the fear of God, who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity? When civilized nations aid and abet each other in nefarious plans for filching from another, weaker, less civilized people its land and liberty, or when they cultivate distrust and illwill against each other until the dreadful arbitrament of war seems the only way to cut the Gordian knot skilfully made by diplomacy, has not the fear of God's statutes vanished from their darkened minds? To have that fear is the beginning of a true estimate of life; it is to begin to see light in God's light shining through the tangled undergrowth of passion, greed, selfseeking; it is to rise above the ethics of the jungle, which still rule over large tracts of business, while they are supreme in international relationships, where we seem to have hardly emerged from the savage state as yet. But God's law is not merely to be feared; when we recognize its beneficent nature and intent, when we perceive that in fulfilling it we fulfil our own highest possibilities, then we arrive at the stage when we render it our unforced homage, our free and glad obedience, and know it for the law of liberty, the law of Christ, the law of love. 'A new commandment give I unto you—that ye love one another.'

How does this fear of God operate *in relation to the individual soul*? To know at each moment that we hold whatever powers we possess under God and from Him; that we are responsible to Him for the use we make of our faculties; that we stand in a direct, close and intimate relation to One who knows us altogether—that is at once a sobering and an uplifting consciousness; it is in this that men and women have found the strength to overcome the world, to despise its paltry bribes, to withstand its angry threats, to keep their hands clean and their hearts unenslaved, and to tread sin underfoot. Once a soul truly fears God he is liberated from every other fear. In this same consciousness, too, our sorrows may be bravely and patiently borne. We do not fear Him as a tyrant, but reverence Him as a parent, whose whole intent towards us is good and gracious; and in His strong hand, though many a hope may fail, and many a star grow dim in the heavens, and the solid ground rock beneath our feet, we are safe. In this world, and in all worlds, we are safe. In a multitude or alone, we are safe. For to fear Him is to trust Him, and to commit our spirits to Him—all whose tenderness we have seen shining in the face of Jesus Christ—for time and eternity. 'The fear of God is the beginning of wisdom,' says the Old Dispensation; 'but,' adds and completes the New, 'perfect love casteth out fear.'[1]

TENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Sympathy and Service.

'And I sat where they sat.'—Ezk 3[15].

There is a verse in one of the later poets of the Roman Empire which is familiar and often quoted. Freely translated it runs: 'I am a man, and I count nothing human foreign to me.' I estrange myself, alienate myself, separate myself from nothing human.

The saying expresses concisely the spirit of service, the spirit of every man who, in devoted sympathy, aspires to do anything for man. God's work in the world is done by the man who mingles with men as one of themselves. Ezekiel had something great to do for God among his captive fellow-countrymen; and this is the first step towards his task. 'I came to them of the captivity at Tel-abib, and I sat where they sat.'

How differently men are related to their fellow-men, in their thoughts about them. There is love and sympathy and honour and yearning compassion, or there is contempt and depreciation, and hard, cruel speech. Think of Napoleon—think of David Livingstone. There are cynics like Swift, who, from an altitude of assumed superiority, look in cold and curious contempt on the life beneath them, who expose human nature unsparingly in its meannesses and weaknesses, and lash it with the strokes of merciless satire to the accompaniment of a shrill laughter, the bitter mockery of which repels us. But there are also those, writers and speakers and workers, who are beside the people. There are patriots, like Mazzini, who fling themselves into the stress of the human struggle for liberty, consumed by a passion for men, even while disappointed and saddened by the unworthiness of those they so nobly serve. There are poets, like Burns, who, from the midst of the people, sing for the people, giving voice to their common life in its joy and love and sorrow and longing, singing for them only because they have shared it all. There are philanthropists, there are social reformers, there are missionary heroes, who take their lives down into the crowded places of human want and misery and sin.

---

[1] J. Warschauer, *The Way of Understanding*, 12.

Ezekiel was of a priestly family, and therefore of high rank among his people. Probably he looked forward to the service of the priesthood as his life-work. But it was not so to be. When Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem, Ezekiel was one of those who were carried captive to Babylon. His prospects were suddenly blighted, and his whole life altered. For five years after his exile we know and hear nothing of him. Then suddenly the Spirit of God fell upon Ezekiel, and he felt called, not to the priestly, but to the prophetic office. He was not to minister to the people from above them as a priest, but to minister among them as a prophet.

And first he must come to know them, their thoughts, their burdens, their aspirations. So he lived among them, and the text puts it in this suggestive and memorable clause—'I sat where they sat.' This is where you find the prophet, the teacher, the pastor, the reformer, the helper, the Saviour. They can serve God to no good purpose anywhere else.

There are places in life where men sit together. Life has its well-defined spheres. Men gather into quarters, into classes and societies. And whether they be great or humble, high or low, God's prophet and watchman must go to the place where the men and women whom he would serve wait for him, and must sit where they sit.

Or, if we take life from another viewpoint which is more important, we find that there are not only these places of varied circumstance and condition but also the places of experience. Human experiences are common and universal because they are human. There are the places of sorrow and the places of joy. There are the places of bitter repentance; there are places of calm peace and serene content; places of darkness and the shadow of death. And we pass from one to another. Experience sends us to what is for us a strange land; and it is well for us then, if in God's infinite goodness and mercy we find beside us there one whom God has sent to sit where we sit, to walk where we walk.

So the thought which we find in our text is simple enough. It is just this—that we cannot influence men and women from a distance. We must come into touch with them.

We have an evident illustration and application of this in what is a feature of modern religious enterprise—the institution of Settlements in the poorest districts of great cities. In these Settlements the workers live among the people.

And so it is all over the world. We do not bring the heathen to Christianity by sending them Bibles which they cannot read. Some must go among them and sit where they sit, learn all their language, and look upon all their life, and enter in thought and sympathy into their need. The command may come upon us to go to such places and such people and sit where they sit. But, even if we cannot share the service thus, let us see that we do not forget the loving watchers of God in the mission-outposts.

But surely there is an aspect and an application of this which none of us can escape. Whether we will or not, we are in continual and close contact with our fellows in all their varying conditions and circumstances and experiences.

When some one is in distress, or in disgrace, we may draw near him and let him understand that, as far as we can, we have thought ourselves into his life, and that what we can do for his heartening and help we will.

It would be good for us all to think of this more than we do. Let the soul have outlet in a wider range of thought and sympathy. Try to sit in soul where they sit who are not of our class or respectability, or education, or opinion, or belief. Only so can come the large charity and the helpful life and co-operation and brotherhood by which the world will be redeemed from selfishness, from the ills that arise from the isolation of life from life, when all seek their own, and think of their own, and look not also on the things of others.

The secret of the prophet's service is the secret of our salvation.

What is the meaning of Christ and His Holy Incarnation? The Son of God comes down among men. He shares the experience of our mortal flesh. He passes into a fellow-feeling with our human ills and needs until they lie upon Him with a weight untold. He feels the burden of our sin. He bears it on His Heart upon the Cross.

Think of the baptism of Jesus. Why was He there among the penitents making the plunge in the rushing waters? He went with the crowd; He sat where they sat. He was beside them listening to the stern words of the desert preacher. He was beside them in their tears of confession. He was beside them in their plunge in the river, identified with them though sinless Himself. That was sympathy, the sympathy by which we are saved.

Truly, never any man did much for the world who did not feel as Christ felt for men. All the good is born of sympathy. We can never bless the world by sitting apart. We can help men only as we make common cause with them, as we sit where they sit in their captivity, as we get beneath their burdens. We see it in the Cross; and the love of Christ constraineth us. He sets us beside those who are waiting for our help, saying, 'A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.'[1]

ELEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

A Modern Substitute for the Gospel.

'Are not Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel? may I not wash in them, and be clean?'—2 K 5^{12}.

Stevenson, in a charming letter dated September 1873, has described a day's walk in Fife, during which he came upon a labourer cleaning a byre, and fell into conversation. As they talked together of this and that, one simple but memorable remark betrayed the real man—'Him that has aye something ayont need never be weary.' 'And that,' comments Stevenson, 'from a man cleaning a byre!'

It is the apprehension of 'something beyond' which is the root of all religion. It is hard to find an adequate definition of religion, but we can at least point to one element linking all the religions of the world together, one common irreducible factor in which the very essence of religion appears to reside: the conviction, namely, of the reality of a world unseen, the sense that behind and beyond and above the material environment that we can touch and handle and control there lies something more, something which calls and signals to what is best within us, as deep calls to deep—in short, as Robert Browning put it,

> The feeling that there's God, He reigns and
> rules
> Out of this low world.

Life presents us with two fundamental facts—man's search for God, God's search for man. But the strange, disquieting thing is that, though each is searching for the other, so often they fail to meet. There are moods in which religious feelings refuse to come, and days when spiritual perception has ebbed quite away. You say your prayers, but it is like talking into the air: you have no vivid sense of any God who is listening. Perhaps after a while you stop praying altogether. What is the use of persevering, you say, when the whole thing has grown unreal? It is the ever-old, ever-new problem: 'O that I knew where I might find Him!'

It brings a host of questions in its train. Is He a God who knows anything about it when things in my little corner of the universe get tangled and go wrong, and my heart is hurt and sore? Is He a God who can lay any hand of healing peace upon my soul when I am rushed and tired and growing hectic? Is He a God who has anything to say to a man left walking in the dark, when some of the kindly lights of life have gone out? Above all, is He a God who can help me when I have done something for which I hate myself? Has He any understanding and compassion and forgiveness and renewal for one who is feeling wretched and miserable and ashamed? Oh that I knew!

'I can't *see* God anywhere. I can't realize Him in personal experience.' That, for countless thousands to-day is the great crucial problem of religion and life. Indeed, many in our generation are feeling the problem so acutely that they are almost prepared to drop the religion of their fathers altogether, and to look out for some alternative.

Undoubtedly, the Great War, and even more, the heaped-up disillusionments of the post-war years, have contributed to this result. Take a book like Vera Brittain's *Testament of Youth*, one of the most significant and revealing documents of our times. Some of you may remember how she tells that one of her earliest childhood memories concerned the accession of King Edward VII. to the throne, and the postponement of the coronation owing to the King's sudden illness. 'That night,' she says, 'I prayed earnestly to God to make the dear King better and let him live. The fact that he actually did recover established in me a touching faith in the efficacy of prayer, which superstitiously survived until the Great War proved to me, once for all, that there was nothing in it.' That challenging sentence is typical of the revolt in religion. Beliefs once regarded as fixed and settled have had their foundations shaken. And many are on the look-out now for some alternative to religious faith, some substitute for the gospel of Christ.

---

[1] J. Rutherford, *The Seer's House*, 101.

Now the point to notice is this. That alternative is ready to hand. A new religion has appeared on the field. It is the worship, not of God, but of man. This is the most serious rival that Christianity in this generation is facing.

It is usually called humanism. But the name matters little: it is the thing—the attitude of mind, the way of life—with which we are concerned. Historically, of course, there have been many brands of humanism. But, broadly speaking, what confronts us to-day as the declared rival of the Christian faith is the theory that puts man in the centre of the picture; that summons him—the old accepted standards of ethics having been eaten away by what Lippmann has called 'the acids of modernity'—to work out his own salvation and construct his own scheme of values; that pins its faith to science and education and mechanism and human brains for the redeeming of the world, rather than to grace and the divine initiative; that seeks, with the aid of psychology, to explain away the supernatural element in religion, reducing Christian belief to mere 'phantasy-thinking' or 'projection'; that substitutes self-expression for Christ's demand of self-surrender, the dictatorship of instinct for the rule of God, and culture for the Cross.

Let us, however, give this rival creed its due. There are scores of thousands of people to-day—especially young men and women—for whom organized religion has lost its grip; and when these, sincerely seeking for something that may fill up what H. G. Wells has called 'the God-shaped blank in their heart,' turn to one or another of the different substitutes for religion now offering themselves, it is doing the cause of Christ no service simply to denounce their revolt. Sympathy and an understanding heart—these we require. Admittedly, what we are witnessing is a revolt; but when you have called it that, you have not necessarily discredited it. For, as Canon F. R. Barry has incisively reminded us, 'Mrs. Grundy, when all is said and done, was not a pattern of Christian conduct.' Nor can any one seriously deny that between the mind of Christ on the one hand, and conventional Christian ethics on the other, there has sometimes been a deep divergence: witness the toleration too often in the past extended by the ethical standards of the time to such things as wars of aggression, and slums, and desperate inequalities, and villainous social conditions.

Nor should it be forgotten that the movement of revolt, at its best, has been a challenge to religion to rescue for the praise and service of God the glories of art and beauty; and that, again through its best representatives, it has been a constant reminder that it is our duty to keep religion free from the obscurantist spirit which is fundamentally irreligious, and to welcome new knowledge eagerly.

The trouble about the modern worship of humanity is that it is *too* human. It cannot see beyond man. It has nothing more satisfying to offer the hungry world than the religion of 'disinterestedness, detachment, and maturity of character,' which Lippmann so eloquently preaches: 'Stoicism in plus-fours,' as Canon Barry perhaps rather irreverently calls it. But this is to misunderstand completely the real problem mankind is facing. Naaman might extol his Abana and Pharpar: but the one question which mattered was, 'Could they make a leper clean?' And our modern vaunted Abanas and Pharpars—the disinterestedness and the culture and the scientific spirit of the age—have undoubtedly much to contribute to the welfare of the race. But that is not the question. The question is, Have they cleansing and regenerating power? A power that is more than human must come into action. *Go, wash in Jordan.*

The rock on which our modern substitutes for the gospel go to pieces is the basic fact of sin. Lippmann himself, at the outset of his *Preface to Morals*, makes the significant confession: 'We have come to see that Huxley was right when he said that "a man's worst difficulties begin when he is able to do as he likes." The evidences of these greater difficulties lie all about us.' And in this age, when scores of voices are perpetrating the fallacy that man can have, and ought to have, absolute, unbridled freedom to do as he likes, and to drive his way down any path of self-expression that he chooses, when so many others (taking their cue from that) begin to believe that almost anything can be justified in the sacred name of the new morality, we need to have it written upon our minds, as with a pen of iron on the rock, that God's will, God's truth, God's throne, God's everlasting decisive difference between right and wrong, that difference for which Christ died, stand as fast and as binding as ever, and claim every decent soul's allegiance.

Eliminate the supernatural, we are being told, if you would be a realist. How often that singularly inept and muddled argument is reiterated! The fact of the matter is that it is precisely the man who believes in the supernatural with all his being (using that word as referring to an order above the natural, prior to it, controlling it and holding it together), it is he who is the only true realist. For he knows better than to allow the visible and the tangible and the material to obsess and tyrannize him. He has seen deep enough into the heart of life to realize once for all that the real forces are the invisible ones. You can't see personality. Yet what a force personality is! You can't see love. But let love get hold of a man, and it can transform him utterly. You can't see life. Yet life is the most creative thing in the universe. And as the invisible things—personality and love and life and beauty and truth and goodness—are all summed up in God, the religious faith which lives, moves, and has its being in God is the true and final realism.[1]

TWELFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Abraham's Altar.

By the Reverend G. Holland Williams, M.A., Little Sutton, Cheshire.

'And he went . . . unto the place where his tent had been at the beginning, between Beth-el and Ai; unto the place of the altar, which he had made there at the first; and there Abram called on the name of the Lord.'—Gn 13^3, 4 (R.V.).

Though the whole land of Canaan lay before Abraham when he, and his wife, and all that he had, returned from their migration to Egypt, he made directly for the site of his old encampment near Bethel and the altar which he had built there when first he arrived in the Promised Land. It was not because the country between Bethel and Ai was familiar ground, or because there was good pasture land in that neighbourhood, that he turned towards it once again. It was the altar that drew him. He had come out of Egypt conscious of certain deep spiritual needs, and he knew that it was only the God whom that altar represented who could satisfy those needs, and give rest to his soul.

The message of this ancient story for us is that we, too, need an altar to which we may, and must, come back again and again: and the story itself suggests three reasons why this is so.

(1) We need an altar to turn to *amid the busy-ness of life*. Abraham, since leaving Ur of the Chaldees, had moved in 'the silence that is in the starry sky, the sleep that is among the lonely hills.' Life for him had been leisurely and unhurried. But Egypt was the home of an advanced civilization, and the scene of great busy-ness. The pace of life on the banks of the Nile was faster than on the hills of Canaan, and Abraham, in the effort to adapt himself to his new surroundings, would inevitably tax his resources both of body and of mind, and would soon feel exhausted and in need of inward reinforcement. Therefore, as he left Egypt behind him, he turned towards the altar between Bethel and Ai, that he might feel the hand of God laid upon his spirit, restoring that poise and strength of soul which the bustle of Egypt had well-nigh worn away.

We too need an altar where the ravages which the world's busy-ness makes upon us may be repaired. In a thousand ways, the speed at which we live to-day has been accelerated, not only in the crowded cities but in the quiet country places as well. In many instances the effort to keep up with the new pace leads to nervous breakdowns, and where these do not result, still the pace tells. It has been said that nowadays the faces of most men and women wear a tired and spiritless look, as though the rush of modern life had drained them of all vitality. And do not we ourselves know that this observation is not far from the truth? We, too, like Abraham in Egypt, are unable to 'stand the pace': we, too, are conscious of our continual need of being refreshed and stabilized in body, mind, and soul. Happy are we if, again like Abraham, we know where to turn. Happy are we if in our lives there is an altar to which we continually resort, and a God whose power to give us peace we have thoroughly proved. Faith in Him has been called 'the best preventative against the maladies of the soul, and the most powerful means of curing them'; and quiet fellowship with Him can restore the soul and dissipate that tiredness which is the price of living in the modern world. For it is written: 'Even the youths shall faint and be weary, and the young men shall utterly fail: But they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; and they shall walk, and not faint.'

(2) We need an altar to turn to *in our times of prosperity*. Abraham, when he came out of Egypt, was very rich in cattle, in silver, and in gold. He had sheep, and oxen, and servants, and camels.

---

[1] J. S. Stewart, *The Gates of New Life*, 170.

And, man of property that he was, he turned instinctively to the altar at which he had worshipped God in the days when he was not so well-to-do. For he knew well what perils lurk in prosperity, and how wealth may destroy the finer feelings of the soul, alienating a man from God and estranging him from his brethren. And knowing this he fell back upon God, that he might be strengthened to carry his full cup with a steady hand and a humble heart, and that he might learn afresh from God what it is that really matters, and what we are really here for. Knowing that prosperity may lure men to adopt unreal values and to cherish unworthy aims, he longed for a saving vision of life as God sees it, and journeyed to the altar between Bethel and Ai.

Prosperity has still its perils, and there is no saving of us from them unless we turn continually to the altar and return to life with the true vision of its meaning and purpose given us there.

(3) We need an altar to turn to *when we have sinned*. Abraham in Egypt had sinned a great sin. Outwardly he was none the worse for it; indeed, it was to that sin that he owed his great prosperity. But, for all his flocks and herds, he was not at peace. It was not merely that he had incurred Pharaoh's disapproval, and still smarted from his rebuke. It was the sting of his own conscience that troubled him, and the knowledge that he had done that which was evil in God's sight. And he knew that there could be no rest for his spirit until, at that altar, he had made humble confession of his sin, and had received forgiveness.

There are those who have no sense of sin, to whom Abraham's experience is a thing unknown. But others of us know it only too well. We too have lived with an accusing conscience. We too have known that we had sinned not merely against our own souls, not merely against our fellow-man, but against the Most High God; and we have known that until we confessed our sin, and received His forgiveness, we should never be at peace within. We have been bowed down beneath a sense of uncleanness, and have felt that at all costs, by all means, our hearts must be made clean within us. We have been conscious of our intolerable separation from God, and we have felt that, above all else that we need, we must be restored to His fellowship, or we perish. How well we understand Abraham's experience, and the urge which drove him to his altar!

If there be no such altar in our lives, at which God meets us in forgiveness, we are of all men most miserable, and nothing is left for us but a darkness of despair, like that which Judas knew, which we shall at last find unbearable. But blessed are we if we know beyond dispute that God does answer our cry for cleansing and reconciliation in Jesus Christ His Son, our Saviour. Blessed are we if we have proved for ourselves, again and again in the past, that 'He pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent, and unfeignedly believe His Holy Gospel.' If we know this to be true, if for us life holds an altar where we have been oft and much forgiven, let us hasten thither now, that we may acknowledge our transgression and find, through God's grace, a forgiveness which is as full as it is undeserved.

THIRTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Last Judgment.

'Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me.'—Mt 25^{45}.

This parable presents certain astonishing features which, once they deeply engage mind and heart, lead into strange places. Most astonishing of all is this: Jesus knew that He was about to die on the Cross, betrayed, lonely, mocked, and yet He dares to speak these august words; dares to speak of His own coming in glory attended by holy angels, and of His facing the whole race of mankind and pronouncing sentence of destiny as their sole judge. Let this be well pondered by those who take Jesus to be something less than His Church takes Him to be—to be perhaps the world's greatest moralist and religious genius, but still no more than man.

Again, is it not astonishing to have presented to us the possibility of a sharp decisive judgment being made between man and man? The Syrian shepherd can simply and certainly distinguish between white-fleeced sheep and black-fleeced goats; there is no possibility of error in his division. Can it really be that men in the end will fall apart so unambiguously as that?

In men whom men condemn as ill
I find so much of goodness still;
In men whom men pronounce divine
I find so much of sin and blot
I do not dare to draw a line
Between the two, where God has not.

Every experienced and sensitive observer of human nature will tend to take up some such attitude as he looks out on the baffling mixture of good and evil in his fellows and inward upon himself. But this parable, and much more than this parable in the teaching of Jesus, would seem to bear out that there is a divine criterion which finally and sharply decides not merely between good and evil in the abstract, but personally between good and evil men. We cannot judge; we ought not to judge; nothing can be more certain than that. But is that only because our impure vision prevents us from seeing? Is the truth that beneath what seems to us a baffling medley of good and evil, wheat and tares inextricably rooted together, there is clearly discernible to the eyes of God a prevailing direction of character, a set of the soul, a ruling passion which either seals men to sonship in His family or brands them as His enemies? Let no shuffling with the moral issues of our personal lives prevent us from facing this formidable question.

Once again, how astonishing are those simple words of our text! How seriously do we take them? Is it possible that below the appearances of sense and outward things, beyond the apprehensions of thought, but nevertheless in very fact and truth, the being and the feeling of Christ are bound up with every individual human life? In some real sense, some very profound and intimate sense, does Christ Himself come to our door with every beggar? Is human nature so sacred as that? Are the everyday contacts of life indeed so fateful as that?

At any rate, two plain teachings shine through this parable of judgment. The first is this: the decisive test of character occurs, not in any abstract realm whatever, but in those concrete situations of life, where, person confronting person, the demand arises for fully personal deed and dealing. Chesterton says somewhere that a man can make only one great discovery, namely, that there are other persons in the world besides himself. Persons have their private and peculiar ideas, feelings and needs organized in an inaccessible citadel of independence, and therefore create a situation of problem and responsibility. Once made or even glimpsed, this discovery of the other person is deeply disturbing to the egotism of human nature, so disturbing that we are all adepts at evading the responsibilities which it imposes. The crudest way of evasion is to ride rough-shod over the other person, thus denying the reality of his personal being by seeking to exploit, enslave or crush him. The feeblest way of evasion is flight. A highland boatman once said, 'There is nothing like the fishing. When you are out fishing, you are interfering with nobody, and nobody is interfering with you, and you are fishing all the time.' This is no doubt an excellent sentiment in its particular reference, but it is craven and disastrous when it is erected into a principle of living.

The former Prince of Wales once spoke this memorable sentence, 'Number 10 Downing Street can never be a substitute for the good neighbour.' That goes deep. Neighbourliness, immediate personal contacts, the courageous embracing of all the risks and responsibilities involved in fully personal relations—these are the bloodstream of a healthy society and a condition of sound personal character. In their absence the more abstract kind of long-range action which, be it granted, is also necessary in an intricate social structure, remains heartless and lifeless. The teaching of our parable is that by such personal attitudes and actions men will finally be judged. Not where theory is argued against theory or where creed challenges creed, but where theory and creed livingly express themselves in the bearing of man to man, in the responsible encounter between persons—there the character is shaped by which the destiny is decided.

Secondly, and within this sphere of personal relationships, men will be judged by the reality of their interest in the unfortunate, by the quality of their compassionate love. Not only from this parable but also from much else in His teaching and from the whole tenor of His life, we can see that Jesus looked upon life as offering one supreme chance of noble action—the chance of lifting or lessening the burdens which weigh men down. He saw all about Him hungry, lonely, sick and guilty men and women; really saw them; saw them not as inanimate scenery or familiar furniture; did not look upon them as though they were broken-down carts, or scarecrows in a field, that do not matter; but saw them as wounded and suffering men and women. Their existence called Him, made Him responsible, moved Him to think and act. So, moved with compassion, Christ went about doing good, and at the last gave Himself to lift the heaviest burden from humanity. That life, that spirit, will be the judge of our lives and spirits; this will be demanded of us in the day of judgment—did we notice Lazarus, or did we manage to be blind to his existence? Seeing him, did we do anything? Did we notice that Lazarus is *always* at our gate? And did we go on doing something as a life-habit, as the normal expression of a settled disposition of the heart?

Some of the younger men and women have not yet chosen their careers. Let them take time before they do so to look without shrinking into the face of the world's suffering and to listen with heart and imagination to such accounts of it as this of Schweitzer's, written from West Africa.

'Physical misery is great everywhere out here. Are we justified in shutting our eyes and ignoring it because our European newspapers tell us nothing about it? We civilized people have been spoilt. If any one is ill, a doctor comes at once. Is an operation necessary, the door of some hospital or other opens to us immediately. But let every one reflect on the meaning of the fact that out here millions and millions live without help, or hope of it. Every day thousands upon thousands endure the most terrible sufferings, though medical science could avert them. Every day there prevails in many and many a far-off hut a despair which we could banish. . . . It is time that we should wake from slumber and face our responsibilities.'

If they let the spirit of such an appeal help to settle their choice of a career, then they will be reckoning not with to-day and to-morrow only, but also, if this gospel of Christ is God's holy and eternal truth, they will be reckoning with God's final judgment upon their lives.[1]

---

[1] A. C. Craig, *University Sermons*, 50.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

Jewish works of importance still continue to appear in Germany. The fifth part of Finkelstein's great edition of *Siphre zu Deuteronomium*[1] carries the work on from Dt 22^{3} to 26^{12}. The high standard reached in the earlier parts of the book is well maintained, and, when complete, the whole will form a great monument of accurate and painstaking scholarship.

To the same general class of literature belongs the *Sifra*, of which a German translation has recently been issued.[2] The *Sifra* is a 'practical' commentary on Leviticus, and, in its original form, it is ascribed to Rabbi Jehudah ben Eleai, a Jewish scholar of about A.D. 150. It has, no doubt, received a number of additions since Rabbi Jehudah's time, but it still serves as a valuable guide to Jewish thought in the age immediately following the great Akiba. In general treatment it resembles the Mishnah, and Dr. Winter has done well to make frequent reference to the Mishnah in his footnotes. The student would do well to have the latter work beside him when reading the *Sifra*. The subject, however, is approached from a different point of view. While the Mishnah is primarily concerned with codifying ancient practice, and with laying down rules for the exact observance of the Law, whose text is introduced from time to time in order to establish its position, the *Sifra* is an actual commentary, and quotes the ritual in illustration of the text. The treatment is as thorough as it could be. At the start the thirteen rules of exegesis, attributed to R. Ishmael, are expounded. Every verse—almost every word—is discussed, and all relevant opinions of any importance are cited. *Sifra* is thus a comprehensive collection of early Rabbinic studies in the Book of Leviticus, and gives us a valuable picture of the Jewish scholarly mind. The translation is accurate and literal, often so literal that a reader unfamiliar with Rabbinic phraseology may sometimes miss the meaning. A much larger number of explanatory footnotes would have been a help to the general public.

Another Jewish work of a very different kind is Maximilian Landau's *Beiträge zum Chazarenproblem*.[3] The history of that strange kingdom of southern Russia, in which contemporary Jews saw a revival of the tribe of Simeon, is still marked by gaps and obscurities. The royal house, and, possibly, a large proportion of the people, accepted Judaism, though opinions differ as to whether this conversion took place in the seventh or in the eighth century. There is a list of kings ('Chagan' was their title) with good Biblical names, among the last before the conquest of the race by Russia being a certain Joseph. Naturally the Chazar court was a place of refuge for persecuted Jews from all parts of the world, and there is still extant a correspondence which is said to have passed between Joseph and Hasdai ibn Shaprut, an official at the court of Cordova. The authenticity of Hasdai's letter has been challenged, and Landau makes a thorough investigation of this point, reaching the conclusion that, while the letter is in substance the work of Hasdai, it was actually written by his secretary, Menahem ben Saruk. In reaching this conclusion the author makes skilful use of the eschatology of the period, and shows some acute critical reasoning on the style of the letter. The second question handled in this little book is that of certain Geniza fragments now at Cambridge, which, apparently, come also from the tenth century, and throw a good deal of light on the relations between the Byzantine empire and the nations to the north and east. The discussion of both these points would have been of more value for the general reader if a brief sketch of the background had first been given, and the documents either quoted in full (Hasdai's letter is a most interesting production) or summarized. As it is, Landau's work will be of value chiefly to experts who have the details of this period always in mind.

---

[1] *Siphre zu Deuteronomium*, pt. v. ed. by Dr. Louis Finkelstein (Stefan Münz, Breslau; RM.6.00). (See also Expository Times, xlvii. 429, 522, 565; xlviii. 523.)

[2] *Sifra*, Uebersetzt von Dr. Jakob Winter (Stefan Münz, Breslau; RM.28.00).

[3] Stefan Münz, Breslau; RM.2.00.

It is unnecessary to discuss at length the *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments in heilsgeschichtlicher Entwicklung*, produced by Lic. Wilhelm Möller, with some help from his son, Lic. Hans Möller.[1] The theological position is, naturally, that which Herr Möller and his family have already adopted in their critical work (see, *e.g.* EXPOSITORY TIMES, xlvii. 565). In this new book we have a general statement of the results of their views regarding the Bible. Large sections are taken, one after another, and the doctrines to be derived from each are indicated. As is to be expected, considerable stress is laid on Messianic prediction. The point of view adopted excludes any sense of a developing appreciation of God; the full picture is there from the outset. The first chapter of Genesis contains clear trinitarian theology, and it is characteristic that two hundred and sixty pages are devoted to the Pentateuch. We have the same self-assertion, the same passion for argument, the same bitterness of feeling, the same curious preconceptions, and the same honesty of conviction as those shown in Herr Möller's critical work. But they are less prominent in this book, and there are one or two passages (especially in the section on th Psalms) from which a number of readers migh derive help and profit. But, on the whole, Her Möller has come no nearer to bridging the gul between himself and his opponents.

The most recent attack on the Graf-Wellhause hypothesis of the Hexateuch is that launched i 1933 by Volz and Rudolph in their joint wor *Der Elohist als Erzähler*. Their thesis was that it i a mistake to include an Elohistic document amon the sources of Genesis, and their position wa argued with learning and skill. To most scholars however, it failed to carry conviction, though i was generally felt that a final decision could no be given till we had seen how the new theory affected the whole of the Hexateuch. The tas has been carried on by Rudolph alone—apparently the two scholars are not agreed on the subject of P in the later books—and we now have the complete work before us.[2]

It is impossible to speak too highly of the scholarship and of the thoroughness with which Rudolph has accomplished his task. He has handled every passage (naturally laying less stress on obvious P sections) with meticulous care, paying attention even to the smallest points, and discussing fairly the work of his predecessors. The result is a close and detailed analysis of Exodus, Numbers, parts of Deuteronomy and of Joshua, with an appendix on Jg 1^1–2^5. More than once it is admitted that the J portion of the text as it now stands embodies variant traditions, and that it is very far from representing the primitive condition of the ancient J document. As a matter of fact, the general result of the analysis does not differ greatly from that normally reached on the Graf-Wellhausen theory; the widest divergences are to be seen in the Balaam oracles and in Joshua. There is in every passage a main thread, ascribed by Rudolph to J; other elements are, for the most part, short sentences or phrases. 'J,' then, includes not only the narratives usually assigned to that source, but also those more continuous sections commonly ascribed to E. The additional elements, which Rudolph does not include under J, are to be grouped under four heads: (i) simple additions, *e.g.* the Song of Miriam (Ex 15^{1-19}) and the Blessing of Moses (Dt 33); (ii) insertions made for emphasis on some religious point; (iii) explanatory notes; (iv) passages derived from sources parallel to those found in Rudolph's J. Several sections which might have been included under this last head are ascribed to J, who is supposed to have had more than one ine of tradition at his disposal, and to have combined what he had.

---

[1] Herrmann, Zwickau; Geheftet RM.12.50; Leinenband RM.13.50.

[2] *Der „Elohist" von Exodus bis Josua*, by Wilhelm Rudolph (Töpelmann, Berlin; RM.18.00).

Since J and E are notoriously more difficult to separate in the later books than they are in Genesis, Rudolph should have had an easier task than he and Volz had in their earlier volume. As a matter of fact, many students will find his position less convincing. The inclusion of variant traditions in J makes that writer a redactor rather than an author, and so merely carries the question of 'sources' one stage further back. More than once the remark is made that additions to the main thread cannot have been drawn from an independent document (*i.e.* from E), because they do not form a connected whole. This would be a valid argument only on the assumption (certainly not made by the Graf-Wellhausen school) that the redactor ('RJE') must have embodied the whole of all his sources. Several longer pieces (*e.g.* the Golden Calf story) can find no room in the main narrative of J, and we are often left with the feeling that Rudolph's arguments would be valid only if it had been irrefutably demonstrated that E never existed. It will be freely admitted that we have here an alternative explanation of the facts, but a theory can hardly be said to be finally convincing merely because it is not impossible. In the present case it can scarcely be granted that the reasons advanced for the new hypothesis are irresistible, and not a few readers, while fully conscious of their debt of gratitude to Rudolph for his fresh and thorough examination of the details, will still prefer the older view. T. H. Robinson.

Cardiff.

Contributions and Comments.

Deuteronomy xxxii. 25.

מִחוּץ תְּשַׁכֶּל־חֶרֶב
וּמֵחֲדָרִים אֵימָה

The word אֵימָה is here usually translated 'terror.' I suggest, however, that in view of the parallel תְּשַׁכֵּל it should rather be combined with the Arabic ايّم 'orbari,' and rendered 'widowhood.'

In support of this interpretation, note that in Is 47^9 שְׁכוֹל is combined with אַלְמֹן, as again in the Ras Shamra text, *The Birth of the Gods Gracious*, lines 8–9.

In La 1^{20} the word אֵימָה is replaced by כַּמָּוֶת. This perhaps reflects a misreading of, or variant to, the original אמת*. Theodor H. Gaster.

London.

Entre Nous.

The Master of the Temple.

The title which Mr. Harold Anson has given to his volume of Recollections and Reflections (Heinemann; 10s. 6d. net) is *Looking Forward*. In the preface he says: 'I have called this book *Looking Forward* because I am not without hope that it may encourage those who may read it, to believe, as I myself believe, that life is abundantly worth living, not only for its own sake, but as a real preparation for the next exciting stage which awaits us, when our work here is done. I am so glad to have lived, and not sorry to be awaiting the new adventures of another world.' This is a volume which sets out to do two things and does them very successfully—to trace the growth of a personality through the impact on it of various movements and events, and to show us a pattern of customs and modes of living not likely to be repeated in a new age.

Harold Anson was born in 1867 at Sudbury where his father was vicar. His parents, he tells us, were deeply religious people. They would never have thought of questioning that families were sent by God and that they had no right to control their number. He was one of a family of fourteen. His father was not only vicar of Sudbury but a Canon of Windsor. 'The annual move from my father's country parish at Sudbury to Windsor was a colossal affair, almost like Noah's entering into the ark, except that, so far as we were aware, it excluded the unclean beasts. We moved complete with as many of the eleven surviving children as were not out in the world, about a dozen servants, two horses, two carriages, and dogs and cats.'

Mr. Anson's mother was a daughter of the fifth Lord Vernon. She was brought up chiefly in Italy, in a very luxurious way and in an eighteenth-century atmosphere. She reacted in her youth against a moral code, 'which she saw to have brought great sorrow, even although it brought her among many charming and cultured men.' She underwent a puritan and evangelical conversion, and instead of the brilliant marriage which had been expected, she married her cousin 'whose only desire was to care for her, and his simple village flock.' Mr. Anson tells a very pleasant story of his mother, that she always made a practice of putting a sovereign into the plate at the Sunday service, but, 'lest this should be discovered on the open plate, she made a sandwich of two pennies, one on each side of the gold coin, and I only discovered the secret one day, when the plate was held by a sidesman with a trembling hand.'

As a child Mr. Anson was very delicate, as the result of typhus fever. After a year at a public school his health became worse and he had to leave and after that had a succession of tutors. He stammered badly, also, but he was able to overcome this, attributing this fact largely to his own deep conviction that he was *meant* to be a speaker.

At Bournemouth where he went to stay with an aunt he was influenced by the somewhat narrow form of evangelicalism that he found amongst his aunt's family and friends. He underwent an experience of conversion and looking back on it what he vaguely remembers is the tremendous 'incandescence' of that time, but the experience lasted only a very short period and he felt later that it was an 'attempt to short-circuit the slow and natural unfolding of the spiritual life. . . . The throwing off of evangelicalism as I had known it, was a step in an effort to find a form of religion int which I could build up the whole of my life withou leaving anything of real value outside the door.'

At Oxford he was influenced by Gore and Scot Holland. He threw himself into social work, wa president of the Christian Social Union, and late was for a time co-editor with Scott Holland of Th Commonwealth. His interest in Christian Socialis never waned, but he gradually moved from th Anglo-Catholic position towards Modernism.

Mr. Anson has a pleasant touch of humour an there are a number of stories in the volume. Som are rather old and some rather exaggerated, and her a little gentle pruning would certainly have bee an improvement. But one of the stories relatin to Christ Church we confess to have a weakness for 'Just before my time, there had been an old Canon known as "presence-of-mind" Banes. Thi name he owed to a story which he was alway delighted to tell. You began by asking him if it were not true that he had once nearly suffered ship-wreck. "Indeed, yes," he would answer, "I and my friends were rowing on a lake, and one of the party fell overboard. In his struggles to re-enter the boat he nearly capsized us all. But *with infinite presence of mind* I caught him a sharp rap on the knuckles, and he sank, and we all got safe to shore." He was particularly proud to be able to recount this bold deed.'

Mr. Anson's experiences have been unusually wide. He was a parish priest in town and country. He had a period in New Zealand where he ministered first in a very scattered area and then was Principal of a Theological College for a few years. On return to England he had no settled charge but was chaplain of the Guild of Health. In this connexion his treatment of 'Spiritual Healing' is suggestive. In 1935 he succeeded Dr. Carpenter as Master of the Temple.

But what Mr. Anson is interested in and what we are interested in is the result of his long and varied experience of people and movements—his thought on the subjects that vex men to-day, his attitude to its many crying problems. This we find in his chapters on 'Marriage Problems,' 'Prayer,' and, especially, in the concluding chapter 'A Credo.' Readers will turn to this for themselves, but we take leave to quote a few sentences on personal immortality. 'One is often asked to-day whether one believes in personal immortality. . . . I certainly don't wish to be "absorbed into the Godhead"—whatever that may mean—it seems to me to argue not only a very low idea of what I am, but also of what God is—something like a vast sponge. Nor is the immortality of the human race a cause which brings me any enthusiasm. So far as I can see, the power behind the universe has taken great trouble to make human beings different. I cannot replace my friend, if he dies, as I could replace my canary, or my pot-plant, by another exactly alike for all practical purposes. It would appear that personality is the highest effort of that great Purpose which the simple-minded of us still call God. Those people that we call the highest and best are most acutely different from one another. Their happiness does not consist in being absorbed into one another, but in remaining consciously separate, though united in love. Why should we then suppose that the universe wants to melt down this elaborate work, and reduce it to the undifferentiated lump? It seems to me exceedingly unlikely. It would appear likely that the quality which is most personal in us is destined to go on to some ultimate perfection.'

The Gospel of Creativeness.

'We are not called, and this I see more clearly than I did, just to imitate Jesus. All imitation is bad, and Jesus would not have us be mere copyists. "Take the holy spirit," He said. We have to grasp His spirit, and become creators of good ourselves, and not copyists.

'If there were no doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Christianity, we might become merely imitators of a past age, looking back continually to the circumstances in which Jesus lived, instead of facing our own circumstances in His spirit.

'It is not the Will of God that we should merely be faithful copyists of a model, pre-ordained for our meticulous efforts to repeat, world without end. We are created to be creators ourselves. Heaven is not a place where we shall enjoy eternal changelessness, but a place in which we shall share in the eternal energy of creation, where God "makes all things new."

'I am sure that this gospel of creativeness needs to be preached far more than it has been in the past. I do not wish to lay less stress upon the redemptiveness of Christianity, its infinite capacity for healing wounds and driving out sin. "Ransomed, healed, restored, forgiven" ought to be a very real experience to every Christian; but that is the beginning and not the end. The end is that he who is ransomed and healed should himself become a creator of new values, through being a partaker in the creative spirit. The neglect of this teaching has made so many religious people listless and dull, and Churches so pathetically anxious as to what they should do next. I have heard good clergymen say that they can't think what to preach about on Whit-Sunday, having already preached many times about the first Pentecost.'[1]

The Problem of Hell.

In the summing up of a discussion in *The British Weekly* on the problem of hell, Dr. Garvie offers a 'provisional conclusion.' We quote a few paragraphs.

'This problem confronted me as a youth sixty years ago, and I cannot forget what toil of mind and travail of soul it cost me, until the Spirit of truth guided me to what for me at least appears to be "the truth as it is in Jesus." . . .

'The words relied upon regarding hell (Mark 9$^{47.48}$) are a quotation from Isa 66^{23}, which is a description of the valley of Hinnom, into which the bodies of criminals were cast, and are evidently used figuratively to describe the penalty of unrepented sin in the future life. That there is such penalty none who accept Christ's authority can question; but a symbol must not be turned into a definition, a metaphor into a dogma. . . .

'It is the revelation of God in Christ which raises the problem. It is many years now since I made it the guiding principle of my theology that I will not believe anything about God inconsistent with the Son's revelation of the Father, nor refuse to believe what can be inferred from that revelation.

'The doctrine of *eternal punishment* in any form is to my Christian reason, conscience and heart an intolerable denial of the love of God as the grace of Christ has imparted it to me, for whom He is Saviour and Lord.

'The doctrine of *conditional immortality*, as often presented with a crude literalism, regarding the meaning of "death" or "eternal" is no less repugnant, although what I shall offer has an apparent resemblance to it, but a real difference. The "larger hope" of *universal restoration*, that at last all shall be saved, may be cherished as a hope, but cannot be affirmed as a certain truth. . . .

'The physical event of death cannot destroy personal identity and continuity of experience and character, nor are we warranted in believing that it must arrest all development, whether for good or evil, or fix finally eternal destiny.

'After death there will be penalty for impenitent sin more severe, manifest and constant hereafter, it may be, than here. There is a terror as well as a tenderness of the Lord. The greatness of God's love in the Cross of Christ to save from sin, the urgency and intensity of the appeal of Jesus for penitence and faith, the awfulness of His warnings of what sin involves, all combine to forbid the too sentimental presentation of the Fatherhood of God, which is responsible for a good deal of moral laxity and licence. God's love is holy love; its end is to make men holy.

---

[1] H. Anson, *Looking Forward*, 287.

'As regards the finally impenitent, if such there should be, I am forced to the conclusion that, as the organism which does not respond to its environment perishes, they will, without any divine intervention to annihilate, fade out of personal existence or suffer the eternal death as unfit for, and unworthy of, the eternal life. But it is not the will of the Father that any should so perish.'

Relativism.

'The outstanding characteristic of our time is the complete disappearance of all absolutes, and the victorious but dreadful dominion of the spirit and attitude of relativism. . . . Of course there are ideals. The world bristles with idealisms, noble and ridiculous, pure and demonic, because man cannot live without them. He is an amazingly fertile creator of idealisms, for without them he starves and degenerates. Absolutes, however, there are not, only pseudo-absolutes. These pseudo-absolutes—race, nation, classless society, a "holy" or "eternal" country—clearly demonstrate that man cannot live on bread, on relativism, alone. When he has, consciously or unconsciously, abolished God, he makes another god, because the need for the divine "word" belongs to the essence of man's nature, for he was created by God and unto God. Notwithstanding that, the rule of the spirit of secularism and relativism is unbroken, the modern pseudo-absolutes are even the acme of this spirit, the most intense expression of it.'[1]

Isaiah lxv. 25.

Mr. C. E. M. Joad, writing in *Time and Tide*, says: 'There are ways and ways of celebrating the summer solstice. In England a small number of enthusiasts gather yearly at Stonehenge to watch the sun rise over the great monolith known as the Friar's Heel. In Germany the longest day is celebrated by pilgrims who climb the Hesselberg, Hitler's "Holy Mountain," and after lighting a huge bonfire on its summit, cast their sins, metaphorically speaking, into it and descend, "purged" for the year. At Stonehenge the ceremony is scientific, traditional, and strictly non-political. No High Priest officiates. On the Hesselberg the ceremony is Nordic to the *n*th, and has a High Priest whose threats and outbursts this year against Priests, Jews, Czechoslovakians, foreign countries, and the League of Nations were strictly political and combined to make a hymn of Hate which far outdid the venom in the old hymn of that name.

'The prophet Isaiah, when he lifted up his eyes to the hills of *his* native country, received a very different impression from them than Herr Streicher received from the Hesselberg. How does it run? "And they shall not hurt nor destroy in all my Holy Mountains. . . ."'

Thanksgiving for Trial.

'The mother of John Gurney's beautiful wife,' wrote Amelia (wife of John Opie, the Painter), 'whom he lost a year after marriage—that mother was now following *him* to his last home, and seeing him deposited by the side of her adored child and husband. We stood opposite to this interesting group, and I could scarcely bear to look at them, yet I could scarcely avert my eyes from them. Then Priscilla (sister of Elizabeth Fry) fell on her knees and uttered I think one of the *very finest thanksgivings for trial*, and mercy vouchsafed the departed dear one, that mortal tongue could speak or mortal mind conceive.'[2]

'Our Father.'

'A friend of mine, still happily alive, was one day speaking to her friend, the daughter of Karl Marx,' writes Father Vincent M'Nabb in *The Listener*. 'The talk turned, as serious talk so naturally turns, to religion. The daughter of Karl Marx said: "I was brought up without any religion. I do not believe in God." Then she added a little wistfully, "But the other day in an old German book I came across a German prayer, and if the God of that prayer exists, I think I could believe in Him."

'"What was that prayer?" asked my friend. Then the daughter of Karl Marx repeated slowly, in German, the "Our Father."'

---

[1] H. Kraemer, *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World.*

[2] J. Menzies-Wilson and H. Lloyd, *Amelia, The Tale of a Plain Friend*, 181.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works,
and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street,
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings
Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It is not every day that we get an outstanding book, but here is a book which deserves to be read and pondered in all the churches.

It is a book written at the request of the International Missionary Council in order to serve as material for the World Missionary Conference to be held in Madras this year. Its aim is to 'state the fundamental position of the Christian Church as a witness-bearing body in the modern world.' Very wisely was the Council guided to commit this task to Professor Hendrik KRAEMER of Leiden, who has produced a really noble book under the title of *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World* (Edinburgh House Press; 8s. 6d. net).

The primary aim of the book is to give guidance to those who are engaged in the missionary work of the Church and are faced with the manifold problems of the non-Christian world. It surveys the present religious situation in the non-Christian world, gives an incisive analysis of non-Christian systems of life and thought, and defines the Christian attitude towards the non-Christian religions.

But it does much more. It goes down to the fundamentals, and its supreme excellence is that it is so profoundly Christian from first to last. The older churches at home as well as the younger churches in the mission field are living in a non-Christian environment, and are urgently called to a deeper understanding of the Christian message and a more courageous presentation of the Christian ethic. With this whole critical situation Professor KRAEMER deals in a singularly fresh and suggestive way, and his exposition of the Christian message is intellectually stimulating and heart-searching to an extraordinary degree.

'In the midst of the cataclysmic events of the modern world and the meeting with great non-Christian religions in their state of partial disintegration and partial reconstruction, the Christian Church needs a clear consciousness of its faith.' Before the divine message can be rightly translated and interpreted it must first be understood. Now the only source from which this knowledge of the Christian faith can be drawn is the Word of God. For the Christian faith is not a philosophy nor a series of religious and moral ideas, but it is based on the revelation of a series of divine acts. It is primarily historical; it comes in the form of a story. It has engendered many ideas, concepts and experiences, but these are never adequate to the revelation from which they flow. 'This world of divine revelational acts cannot be explained in terms of human evolution as ideas that have developed, but can only be stated in the form of a story. . . . Therefore, to the Bible we will turn, because there the witness of the prophets and apostles is to be found on which the Church is built.'

Now to get into line with Bible thought is not so easy as it seems. 'The reason for this is obviously that the religious and moral universe which we enter in the Bible is radically different from what we meet anywhere else and also from our natural habits of thinking, even our so-called "Christian" thinking.' The Bible is radically religious, because radically theocentric. 'God, His holy Will, His acts, His love, His judgment, is the beginning and the end of all. Man and the world are brought in direct, immediate relation to this God, who always takes the initiative.' Many efforts have been made to insert the Christian faith in the great immanent process of human creativity in the field of religion, but it constantly eludes these endeavours. Its origins are irreducible. The Bible offers no philosophy or ethical system or world view. Doubtless, ideas about the personality of God, the infinite value of man and the call to a higher life are derived from the Bible. But it is 'an adulteration of the concrete and radical religious realism of the Bible and the Christian faith to take these derivatives as the essential and abiding invariables of the Gospel.' The essential message and content of the Bible is always the Living, eternally active God, the indubitable Reality, from whom, by whom, and to whom all things are, and it challenges man in his total being to confront himself with this reality and take decisions accordingly.

As the supreme interest of Bible writers is religious, and not metaphysical or philosophical, or even theological, they offer no theory about revelation, yet it is the pre-supposition upon which their whole witness is built. And by revelation they mean not simply enlightenment or a sudden intuitive insight or a luminous idea or knowledge about occult facts, but something quite radical and absolute and *sui generis*. 'Revelation in its proper sense is what is by its nature inaccessible and *remains so, even when it is revealed*. The necessary correlate to the concept of revelation is therefore faith. It lies in the very nature of divine revelation that the only organ for apprehending it is faith; and for the same reason faith, in this strictly religious sense, can only be appropriately defined as at the same time a divine gift and a human act.' Revelation in Christ is a free divine act of redemptive irruption into the life of man and of the world, a tale about the wonderful things God has done. Therefore, along with faith, there must also go witness-bearing. The divine story must be told. Those who have believed with the heart must confess with the lips. This is the very *raison d'être* of the Church.

What, then, is the heart of the Christian message which the Church believes and preaches? It may be variously expressed, but probably it will best accord with Biblical realism to 'take as a starting-point the answer of Peter after his first missionary speech, when many people asked him, "What are we to do?" He answered, "Repent, let each of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins." Jesus Christ and the remission of sins are the divine elements; repentance is the human element in the structure of the Christian faith.' The joyful news that rings through the gospel is of the forgiveness of sins, a never-ending wonder, a miracle of God's free and sovereign grace. It is the grossest misunderstanding to take it as a matter of course. Human reason may argue that, if God is love, surely forgiveness is the most obvious thing to happen. 'It is not. At any rate not if one wants to be radical and earnest as the Bible is, which disregards all our human diluted conceptions of love, of forgiveness, and of God. God's love is holy love, and therefore radical love. Because God loves man the sinner, radically, He condemns him radically. His holy condemnation of sin and the sinner is a sign of His love, because disregarding the reality of sin would be indulgence, not love. It would mean destroying holiness, on which depends the validity of all moral life.'

This forgiveness is made possible through the incarnation and work of Jesus Christ. Without doubt 'Jesus represents His own person and work as central in His whole message.' He confidently claimed the supreme place in God's plan for the world. And from the day of His resurrection the Church has borne witness to the divine victory over sin and death, inviting everyone to believe in Him and thereby share in this victory and in the new life in the Spirit. 'Jesus is Lord' is the apostolic testimony, and His people wait with joyous expectation the manifestation of His glory and the coming of His Kingdom in its fullness.

'The dominant point in the Christian ethic is the same as in the Christian faith. It is embedded in the same sphere of concrete religious realism, and is, like the Christian faith, radically religious and theocentric. Consequently it is, just like the Christian faith, entirely incommensurable with all other ethics in the world.' Its root and inspiration are in the redeeming love of God in Christ. It is not asceticism or moral heroism; it is the natural fruit of the Spirit. In its essence it is spontaneous, free, serene, victorious. It issues in love to man since 'our fellow-man as such has infinite value because he is God's creature, and he is to be loved because of this fact and because it is God's will. Therefore the love of enemies and of the most disgusting and hopeless of men is, in the sphere of this radically theocentric ethic, as natural as the shining of the sun.'

Facing a non-Christian world, as the Church does to-day, a clear and vigorous conception of what the Christian faith is and stands for is a matter of life and death. Man's religious thinking is confused as never before with conflicting world views and impressive claims of ethnic religions. 'Everywhere in the Christian Church, in the West and in the East, there arises the cry for theology, real theology, in order to give a new and much-needed sense of direction and consistency to Christian thinking, feeling and willing . . . It ought, therefore, to be repeated with the strongest emphasis possible that the prime necessity in this situation is a *religious* confrontation with and orientation upon the radical religious realism of the Bible. This means to expose the totality of our being to the claim of the Biblical revelation for absolute allegiance to it—half-hearted allegiance means no allegiance at all—and then to take decisions.'

Dr. H. L. GOUDGE was led to think at the Edinburgh Conference of 1937 on Faith and Order that in important respects Catholics and Protestants are nearer together than they used to be. But while at Edinburgh agreements and disagreements were registered, a real effort is needed to get rid of the disagreements. And in the concluding chapters of an interesting and refreshing volume he would indicate the changes necessary both in the Roman Church and in other communions if the great cause of the reunion of Christendom is to be substantially furthered.

The volume is entitled *The Church of England and Reunion* (S.P.C.K.; 8s. 6d. net), and is animated by the conviction not only of the necessity of reunion but of the mediating part which the Church of England ought to play. In the first portion of the work the present situation is critically surveyed; in the second portion, the doctrine of the Church and Ministry is constructively expounded; while in the third portion the problem of reunion is practically considered. It is part of the third portion that we would here summarize.

The purpose of God is the creation of a perfect society in an environment fitted for it, and not the creation of a number of mutually independent 'saints' or independent communities. If the Church is to realize that purpose, it must be one visible community, with a life of its own, standing out clearly against the background of the world, witnessing to God, and attracting the world to Him by the glory of its life. With such presuppositions our author is naturally led to affirm that among Christian communions the Church of Rome best corresponds to the divine purpose.

In some respects Apostolic Christianity is preserved in the Roman Church more faithfully than anywhere else. Not only is the Roman Church the great visible society that the Church is meant to be, but it overrides national distinctions and class distinctions in a remarkable way, and in an equally remarkable way witnesses to all the truths of the Christian faith. But in two important respects the Roman Church does not correspond to 'the pattern in the mount.' The first is its toleration, and even support, of the Mediterranean paganism which entered the Church when it became the religion of the Empire. The second is the autocratic spirit inherited from that Empire itself.

We shall not follow Dr. GOUDGE in his exposition under the first head of the cult of Mary. He appears to suggest that, on the one hand, the best and wisest Roman Catholics would go back to a time before the belief arose that the mind of Mary, like the minds of the divinities whom she supplanted, was universal; and that, on the other hand, with the doctrine of the Communion of Saints again coming into its own outside the Roman and Eastern Churches, a fuller recognition is being accorded of the place held by the Blessed Virgin in the purpose of God.

Nor shall we follow our author in his exposition under the second head of the Roman claim to authority. He indulges the hope that in time this claim, which interferes with the claims of conscience and of God, will be abandoned. Nowadays the Holy Father is only regarded as infallible under conditions which hardly ever occur. The ultimate authority belongs in fact to the Church in union with the Holy Father, and not to the Holy Father himself. And a meaning may be given to the infallibility of the Church which is in accordance with the New Testament teaching, and on which the various communions may be united. The teaching which the Church as a whole has given throughout the centuries, and which its members have accepted, we may take to be, if not infallible, 'as little removed from infallibility as is no matter.'

'If the changes for which we hope pass over the Roman Church, it will be comparatively easy for the rest of Christendom to enter into union with it, and even to give to the Bishop of Rome, not only recognition as the chief Bishop of Christendom, but functions in relation to the whole Church which will be invaluable for the preservation of discipline and unity.'

So far the Roman Church. What now of the changes necessary in other communions? As a step toward reunion the Church of England and Protestant communions must begin, says Dr. Goudge, to rid themselves of three characteristics —individualism, indiscipline, and nationalism.

Individualism he regards as the first and greatest obstacle to reunion. It is the great curse of Protestantism and of Anglicanism, and not least of Anglo-Catholics. While we cannot surrender either our individual judgment or our individual conscience, we should profoundly mistrust both when we find them out of harmony with those of our fellow-Christians.

Individualism leads to indiscipline, which is widely prevalent in the Church of England and among Protestants generally. At the Edinburgh Conference the suggestion that it was the duty of the Church to discipline the lives of its members occasioned much laughter. 'What Calvin, not to say St. Paul, would have thought of this passes imagination.' But it is the natural result of the view that it is our individual welfare, and not the welfare of the Church as a whole, with which we should be primarily concerned.

As for nationalism, the third characteristic commonly found in churches outside the Roman obedience, it still shows itself in a strong tendency at least to put the welfare of the nation rather than that of the universal Church into the foreground of thought and effort. Despite the large exodus of the world from it, the Church of England is by no means free as yet from nationalism. But, as secular education and freedom of thought grow, the identification of the churches with the nations will pass away to the decrease of their members and the increase of their purity. Healthful reunion may have to wait for that.

Dr. Goudge's positions are apt sometimes to be misunderstood, and in any case they will hardly meet with universal acceptance; but he must be given the credit of his conviction that the reunion of the Church of God is a far more important work than the endeavour to apply Christian principles to national and international life. These principles, as he urges, are not likely to be understood or accepted unless they are first illustrated, and their successful working demonstrated, in the life of the Church itself.

The significance of the rise of the Totalitarian State for Christianity has been so often referred to in these 'Notes' that some readers may be a little tired of the subject. Yet it is a matter of such vital importance that we make no apology for returning to it, whenever a noteworthy pronouncement on the topic is made.

One of the most suggestive utterances is that of Professor André Philip, a learned member of the French Chamber of Deputies, who was invited to deliver the 'Burge Memorial Lecture' for the current year, and whose Lecture on *Christianity* *and Present Day International Relations* is published with an 'Introduction' by the Master of Balliol (S.C.M.; 6d. net). His views are of interest as those of one distinguished both as a Christian philosopher and a practical politician.

The philosophy latent in the notion of a Totalitarian State may be, and often is, criticised as an infringement of the value of personality. In that there is obvious truth. The difficulty, however, emerges that in practice Democracies, too, are endlessly engaged in curtailing individual liberties. One is 'regimented' in all sorts of ways whether one lives in Britain or in Germany; and it might be argued that in actual practice for the average individual, Fascism or Nazism or Russian Communism is only some degrees more thorough than our so-called Democracy in limiting individual freedom.

That the problem of individual freedom is a very old one, and a very complex one, Professor PHILIP is well aware; and his criticism of Totalitarianism is not primarily on the ground of violation of human right. He does not plead for individual freedom. On the contrary, he pleads for complete surrender. Only the surrender must not be made to Society, nor to Nation, nor to State. It must be made to God; and his criticism of Totalitarianism just is that it demands a giving to Cæsar of what is due to God. The State or the Nation, in fact, usurps the place of God. Totalitarianism is a neo-paganism. In Germany the Nation is God, and Hitler is His prophet.

God is the only absolute Sovereign—that is the Christian view. Society, and Nation, and State have their due place. One may truly enough say that they are ordained of God. But they are not sovereign for the Christian. In serving them he will be mindful that for him the supreme consideration is the Will of God.

Such necessary entities as Society, Nation, and State are of mixed composition. They are constituted by *sinful* humanity. Here Professor PHILIP takes the same view as Reinhold Niebuhr in his 'Burge' Lecture last year. The State can too easily become 'demonic,' and when it is conceived as itself the supreme end, it is certain to become so.

Christians then, says Professor PHILIP, 'have to be united in a solemn condemnation in the name of God's sovereignty of every form of Totalitarian State, Nation, or Society.'

But we live in a world alongside Totalitarian States. What is to govern our attitude towards, or our dealings with, them? We are in the world and have our part to play, and no Christian dare shirk his responsibilities as, in the Professor's view, some Pacifists seem to do. That is the first thing the Christian must realize—his personal responsibility for what is happening in the world.

His second recommendation is not to overemphasize the value of non-violence. It sometimes succeeds, sometimes it does not. Our pacifist friends will find this a hard saying, but many are saying it, and with some reason. The Professor is convinced that had the Democracies acted differently when Japan invaded Manchuria, the story of Abyssinia and of China would have been different.

That, of course, takes us into a highly controversial sphere and we should be sorry if the Professor's *political* views diverted any from consideration of his *religious* views. Christians may differ among themselves as to technical details in the solution of any actual problem, but all need to be recalled to the sense of God's sovereignty, their own responsibility, and the essence of the Christian attitude to the bewildering situations with which a rapidly changing world confronts us.

One of the most suggestive things in the Lecture emerges here. We have erred, we are told, in asking what is the Christian 'rule,' or even what is the Christian 'principle,' to be applied in the solution of a problem. Christ did not lay down rules or expound 'principles.' He inculcated an 'attitude' to life and its problems. He was not a 'moralist,' who came with new rules. He came to bring communion with a Father instead of obedience to a rule.

The Greek Style of St. Paul.

By the Reverend R. Martin Pope, M.A., B.D., University College, Southampton.

Readers of Peake's lecture on 'Paul the Apostle: his Personality and Achievement,' reprinted in the *Bulletin of John Rylands Library*, 1928, will recall his reference to the opinion expressed by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff on St. Paul as 'a classic of Hellenism.'

This was a striking testimony from one of the most brilliant and learned of German classical scholars given in *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, 232 (1912, Leipzig-Berlin). It is quoted with approval by Johannes Weiss in his *History of Primitive Christianity*, which has recently been translated under that title from the original to the great benefit of English readers, and contains a penetrating study of Pauline style by one of the most enlightened critics of the Apostle's writing. It is worth while to turn to Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's critique. He believed that while St. Paul never borrowed directly from Hellenic culture, yet there could have been no St. Paul without Hellenism. His textbook was the Greek Bible, and he thought only in Greek, while remaining to the end 'a Jew, as Jesus Christ was a Jew . . . he is great because of what he inherited from his own people, but more especially because of what is particularly his own self as opposed to the Greek.' He then proceeds to point out that his Greek has nothing in common with any school or model, but 'flows straight from the heart, clumsily, a hasty sputter, yet real Greek—no translation from the Aramaic, like the sayings of Jesus.' The phrasing suggests a mountain stream moving to a definite goal but in its course broken by interposing stones into eddies and twists. This may be accepted as a vivid figure of St. Paul's style, especially in the two Corinthian Epistles where the soul of the Apostle throbbing with varied emotions of sorrow and joy, sternness and gentleness, speaks now in tones of remonstrance and strong condemnation and now in those of gratitude and hope. There is no parallel to his Greek style in his predecessors or in contemporary Hellenistic writers. Philo of Alexandria (died *c.* A.D. 41) has often been brought into comparison with Paul, and Prof. A. D. Nock in his recent *St. Paul* has made a well-balanced statement of the relationship between them. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, who gives a brief critique of Philo immediately preceding that of St. Paul, expresses an unfavourable opinion of him. His Judaism appears to be half-hearted: he puts on two different masks in his endeavour to present the Torah in terms of Greek philosophy to his contemporaries, and in this way discloses his immunity from the fanaticism of his compatriots. The faith of his fathers sinks into the background, while he displays himself to the public at large as a scholar used to all the forms of philosophic writers in a style which is 'the same throughout, grandiose, rhetorical, well-constructed, overflowing with words, hardly the first beginnings of Atticism, a link between Posidonius and Plutarch if such a link could be constructed.' Others take a more favourable view of Philo, but that he influenced St. Paul has never been established, though it is not unlikely that the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Fourth Gospel owed something to the teaching of the Jewish Alexandrian school, even if certain elements in the Philonic system—such as his view of the Logos—were entirely alien to Christian thought. Philo is an imitator of Greek models both in thought and style, while St. Paul's style is all his own. None of the epithets applied to Philo by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff could be fitly used of the Apostle's style. His familiarity with the LXX left its mark on his diction, especially the Wisdom writers, whose exposition of ethical maxims is set forth in the typically Semitic forms of parallelism and antithesis. Perhaps actual Semitisms are less noticeable in St. Paul than in St. Mark and the other Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel. Some mannerisms, such as his extended use of the preposition ἐν (often like the Hebrew בְּ), and the use of the genitive of definition in such phrases as *θάνατος σταυροῦ*, are typically Semitic (see for others, Moulton and Howard *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, ii. 413–485).

What, then, entitled the Apostle to the place of a 'classic'? Certain it is that the form of his writings, the Epistle, was a new feature. It is not a personal letter like the papyri letters: even the private letter to Philemon has a certain carefulness of expression as befitting a judgment of momentous import on an aspect of the Christian ethic. 'Nor is it literature, it is some inimitable mixture,' says Wilamowitz-Moellendorff: but I question if he does not go too far in adding, 'he has no artistic vein.' He deprecates and counters the obvious objection that may be raised against this verdict from the example of the Hymn of Love which has to most readers more than a touch of artistry: for he considers that he employs the same 'rhetorical figures' which are used in the speech of Agathon in Plato's *Symposium*—an interesting reference to which we shall return—but, on the other hand, confesses that 'the formlessness of his style is refreshing in a world of conventional forms, polished beauty and platitudes.' He adds the opinion which will not carry conviction to all minds that Plato, while he would have acknowledged the value of Paul's religious personality, would have been out of sympathy with him because of his lack of form and because he was not a Greek.

It has to be admitted that there is a lack of regularity and smoothness in the sentences of the Apostle and both *anacoluthon* and *aposiopesis* interrupt their grammatical construction. But here we may quote Jowett, who in his Preface to the *Dialogues of Plato*, p. xx, remarks on 'the ear and intelligence of the Greeks for long and complicated sentences which is rarely found in modern nations,' and adds that 'there was nothing shocking to the contemporary of Thucydides and Plato in anacolutha and repetitions,' though in later Greek the tendency was towards simplification and precision.

Deissmann always insisted on the non-literary style of the Apostle, *e.g.* in *Paulus* (Eng. Tr., *St. Paul*: *A Study in Social and Religious History*, 53). It was a sort of obsession with him that St. Paul was a man of the people and a member of the artisan non-literary classes, explaining his 'large letters' (Gal 6^{11}) as the writing of a workman's hand deformed by toil. Yet he separates him from the proletarian class, and admits that the evidence of contemporary papyri reveals a superiority in his vocabulary which lifts him above colloquialism. This is certainly a noteworthy feature of his style: *e.g.*, in 1 Co 13 we find at least nine expressions which are without parallel in the Greek Testament. By all students this chapter and the closing verses of Ro $8^{31f.}$ are singled out as showing marks of careful workmanship and suggest a certain deliberateness in the choice of words and real literary craftsmanship. It is, in fact, the variety of his vocabulary which rather discounts the argument based on the number of *hapax legomena* in the Pastoral Epistles which has been often urged against the authenticity of those writings. Nägeli's monograph on the 'word-treasury' of the Pauline writings illustrates the wealth of the Pauline word-system. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff concludes by the statement that the classics created classics only on Latin soil, while Greek had long passed its artistic prime, even if Paul, Epictetus, and Plotinus wrote in that language from the heart.

If, then, the evidence of style leads to the conclusion that Pauline Greek is that of his age, when the Greek language had been and continued to be subject to the influences arising out of the mingling of races in the Græco-Roman world, it yet remains an individual achievement in the Epistles, which became a powerful medium of direct personal appeal. Exposition and doctrine found expression in terms which were accompanied by entreaty, exhortation, reproof, condemnation, and judgment as the conditions of the community required or evoked. Never was there a clearer example of the truth that 'the style is the man.' The Greek may be faulty, broken, rapid: yet the writer rises at times to artistry of a remarkable order while his spiritual intensity will ever seem to be worth more than classic ease and elegance. Jowett considered that an 'interminable marsh' succeeded the classic age of Greek literature: 'only in Plutarch, in Lucian, in Longinus, in the Roman emperors Marcus Aurelius and Julian, in some of the Christian Fathers are there any traces of good sense or originality or any power of arousing the interest of later ages.' The nature of the language in which the New Testament was written does not enter into his survey: but it is to be remarked that in his introduction to *The Dialogues of Plato* he frequently adduces parallels with St. Paul, especially in the group which contains the *Symposium* and the *Phaedrus*. And here one may quote the testimony of Edward Norden in his *Die griechische Kunstprosa* (quoted by J. Weiss *op. cit.*), who in speaking of the noble earnestness and enthusiasm of the Apostle adds that 'the diction of the Apostle in such forms as 1 Co 13 and Ro $8^{31f.}$ rises to the height of the Platonic *Phaedrus*.'

It is sometimes stated that St. Paul's quotations, like those from Menander in 1 Co 15^{33} and Epimenides in Tit 12, are mere popular tags, and the quotation from Aratus of Soli (or possibly from the Hymn of Cleanthes)—*τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν* (Ac 17^{28})—may be due to Luke his reporter. But it is surely not impossible that St. Paul as a young man at Tarsus became acquainted with some of the Greek classics, and that if he listened to Stoic lecturers who had been trained in the school of Athenodorus of Tarsus, he would become acquainted with the thought of Plato, which influenced the Stoic creed, moral and religious. Undoubtedly, Stoicism left a mark alike on his mind and his language even if he never had actual contact with Seneca. The diatribes of Epictetus (died *c.* A.D. 150), as recorded by Arrian, show traces of the influence of the N.T. writings and contain parallels in expression and thought, although there is no proof that Epictetus was well disposed towards Christianity or had read its literature. It is, of course, in the ethical teaching of St. Paul that we are reminded of the elements of Roman Stoicism, which had a healthy effect on the social life of the early empire.

The speech of Agathon given in the *Symposium*, referred to above, is on the theme of love and contains expressions which strike the reader as curious anticipations of St. Paul's treatment—*e.g.* 'love is our lord who sends courtesy and sends away discourtesy, who gives kindness ever and never gives unkindness, the friend of the good, the wonder of the wise, the amazement of the gods . . . regardful of the good, regardless of the evil—saviour, pilot, comrade, helper, glory of gods and men, leader best and brightest, in whose footsteps let every man follow . . .' (Jowett's translation). But Plato rises to a greater height in the speech of Diotima as reported by Socrates, where love attains the perfect vision of beauty by an ascent 'from fair practices to fair notions, until from fair notions he arrives at the notion of absolute beauty and at last knows what the essence of beauty is' (*ib.*). Perhaps, however, the closing prayer of Socrates in the *Phaedrus* affords a clearer parallel with St. Paul's distinction between flesh and spirit when he says, 'Give me beauty in the inward soul and may the outward and inward man be at one' (*ib.*). Another parallel with the noblest forms of classical thought may be quoted from the *Antigone* (454–5) of Sophocles: here the heroine in a famous passage claims that 'the unwritten and unfailing statutes of heaven are more binding than mortal decrees'; similarly, St. Paul allows to the Gentile world without the law 'the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness therewith' (Ro 2 ^{15}).

Such links with the deepest aspirations of the Greek mind are powerfully suggestive to those who believe with the Greek theologians that the Logos or Word-Reason of God was leading man's spirit through the ages to Christ, informing the intellect of prophet and philosopher—an Isaiah and a Plato alike. τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα αἰώνια (2 Co 4^{18}) is the essence of Platonism, and when we pass from St. Paul to Plotinus, we discover that the Greek language is the medium of a mystic philosophy which powerfully influenced mediæval thinkers like the Areopagite and Scotus Erigena and to-day is the subject of the fresh and absorbing contemplation of many minds.

It is, then, on the ground not of the Greek style of the Apostle but of his passionate gospel of redemption set forth in a popular idiom but bearing the stamp of his own individuality that the judgment of Wilamowitz-Moellendorff and others may be justified that St. Paul was 'a classic of Hellenism.' The Epistle, a new form of literature, was fashioned by a master hand into

. . . a trumpet; whence he blew
Soul-animating strains—alas, too few!

At his best, as E. Norden says, he gave to the Greek language 'that which for hundreds of years had been lost, the earnestness and enthusiasm of a man who has been inspired by union with his God, such as we only meet in Plato and, finally, Cleanthes.' But the Platonic vision of reality and the Stoic hymn to the First of the Immortals have given way to something more profound and more satisfying for human need. Plato had indeed sublimated the Greek term ἔρως and setting it free from degrading associations, identified it with the contemplation of the Eternal Beauty. St. Paul chose another term ἀγάπη and brought it into harmony with the concept of personality which was never grasped by Greek philosophy. God was a Person, and God was Love. Love was greater than γνῶσις, the central motive of all the mystery cults, and in the Person of Christ in whom the union of God and man was perfected the redemption of the world was achieved. His was the Name above every name at which 'every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth.' Henceforth 'every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.' To the advocacy of this truth which had made him a new man, the Apostle dedicated his life, leaving as the monument of his labours the letters which hold a secure place in the supreme literature of the world.

Some Theological Implications of Agape and Eros.

BY THE REVEREND PHILIP S. WATSON, M.A., HEADINGLEY, LEEDS.

IN his book *Agape and Eros*[1] Dr. Anders Nygren has made a study of Agape, the Christian idea of love as found in its original purity in the New Testament, and contrasted it with Eros, the Hellenistic idea prevalent in the world which Christianity first entered. Agape is a love which consists in pure self-giving; it is Divine love, welling out of the heart of God and revealed at its deepest in the Cross of Christ. Eros is a love whose motive is pure self-seeking; it is a form of human love, a longing for possession aroused by the desirability of its object. These two ideas of love were originally quite distinct, but they soon inevitably came into contact with one another, and the story of their mutual relationships through the ages largely forms the history of 'the Christian idea of love.' That history has now been written in *Agape and Eros*, Part II.,[2] of which an English translation is shortly to appear. It is a dramatic record of conflict between Agape and Eros, in which the two ideas appear sometimes in conscious and open hostility, sometimes rest in cool compromise, and in one outstanding instance are united in an uneasy synthesis which in some quarters persists to this day.

Both parts of this work are intended as a scientific study of the Christian idea of love, and no attempt is made to draw out its theological implications. These are not difficult to deduce when the argument is understood—if Part I. has left the reader in doubt, Part II. will go far towards clarifying the issue—yet Dr. Nygren's thesis has been subject to misinterpretations and criticisms which seem strange, not to say perverse, to one who has read most of his writings and enjoyed many unforgettable conversations with him. It is intended in this article, so far as space will allow, to deal with certain major errors of interpretation and to indicate some of the main theological bearings of Agape and Eros, taking as a basis Fr. Hebert's estimate in his Translator's Preface to Part I. and Dr. Leonard Hodgson's criticisms in his Bishop Paddock Lectures.[3] Neither of these writers has properly understood what is meant by either Agape or Eros, and both therefore demand a reconciliation of two ideas which are in fact irreconcilable.

Both Fr. Hebert and Dr. Hodgson give a definition of Eros which is superficially true but fundamentally misleading. Eros is, they say, 'the upward movement of the soul to seek the Divine' (p. vi) or 'the quest of the soul for God' (p. 36).[4] Now Eros is, in a certain sense, the soul's quest for God; in another sense, it is not a quest for God at all. Eros is fundamentally man's desire and longing for that which will satisfy his needs. He may seek this in the lower, material world of time and sense; but he will not find it there, for things temporal and sensible are imperfect and transient, and in such things the soul can never find complete and permanent satisfaction. The soul belongs by nature to the intelligible, spiritual world, the higher world of eternity, and nothing less will satisfy it. Man's Eros must therefore be set free from earthly entanglements and purified, so that in virtue of its purity the soul may rise out of this world into the eternal, and there find satisfaction in God. The Eros that is directed downwards to the lower world is called 'vulgar Eros'; that which is directed upwards to the higher world is 'heavenly Eros.' We are concerned, of course, with the latter; but it should be noted that the difference between the two lies, not in their essential nature, but rather in the objects to which Eros, man's desire and longing, is directed.

There are two objections in principle to this conception. In Eros man seeks what will satisfy him entirely and permanently, his own *summum bonum*; this he identifies with God; therefore he seeks God. But if he had identified his highest good with something other than God, he would not seek God at all; in the last resort, the quest of Eros is for man's own highest good and not for God. But to attain to God as its highest good, the soul must be pure; therefore in Eros man seeks moral and spiritual purification: that is, he seeks the ethical good; but he seeks this only as a means to an end. Eros is, strictly speaking, both irreligious and immoral. It is immoral because it seeks the good as a means to an end—even though that end be the attainment of fellowship with God; and it is irreligious because it seeks fellowship with God as a means to an end—the satisfaction of its own desire. The good ought to be sought for its own sake, because it is good; and God ought to be sought for His own sake, because He is God.

---

[1] *Agape and Eros*, Pt. I, 'A Study of the Christian Idea of Love.' (S.P.C.K., 1932.)

[2] *Agape and Eros*, Pt. II, 'The History of the Christian Idea of Love.' (S.P.C.K., 1938, 2 vols.)

[3] *Grace in Faith and Philosophy* (Longmans, 1936), 35–42.

[4] The references in brackets are to Fr. Hebert's Preface (Roman figures) and to Dr. Hodgson's book (English figures),

At almost every point, Agape is the antithesis of Eros. It has nothing to do with desire and longing. It does not seek to satisfy its own needs, but to supply the needs of others. 'Agape seeketh not its own.' It does not seek to ascend out of this world to a 'higher world,' but it comes into this world. Whereas Eros is aroused by the real or fancied worth of its object, Agape is 'indifferent to value' and 'uncaused'; that is, Agape is not motivated by anything outside itself; it is a *quellende Liebe*, welling forth spontaneously from its own infinite resources without consideration of the worth or lack of worth in its object. It is revealed at its deepest in the Cross of Christ, where it sacrifices itself utterly for those who have not only no merit, but are actually possessed of the positive demerit of sin. 'God proves His own Agape toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.' Not that Agape *prefers* the sinner to the righteous; if it did, it would be a 'caused' love, motivated by the *un*worthiness of its object! The perfection of God's love is displayed in the sending of His sun and rain on both the good (though *not because of* their goodness) and the evil (*in spite of* their sin) alike. And even when it meets with no success, even when rejected and cast out and crucified, Agape does not cease to be love; it is prepared to be a 'lost love,' for even when it finds its labour lost, 'Agape never faileth.'

From the point of view of Agape, Eros is sin; and it is sin in a peculiarly refined and subtle form. It professes to seek the good, and it professes to seek God; yet all the time it 'seeketh only its own.' It is egocentric, and egocentricity—self-seeking and self-centredness of every kind—is irreconcilable with Agape, God's own love, which is from first to last theocentric. It must, however, be strongly emphasized that Dr. Nygren's thesis is dealing with ultimate principles, with the ideas of Agape and Eros in their absolute purity. He does not suggest that no other elements than those of pure Eros ever entered into Hellenistic life and thought; nor that nothing else but pure Agape has ever entered into the Christian tradition—quite the reverse, as Part II. will show.

Dr. Hodgson contends that Dr. Nygren's treatment of his subject is 'artificial' (pp. 37 and 40), on the grounds that he has selected a 'specialized' use of both Eros and Agape, and that he has 'mishandled' the New Testament to suit his purpose.

'A certain specialized use of Eros, developed in the Plato-Aristotle-Plotinus tradition, is contrasted with a certain specialized use of Agape which is alleged to be developed in the Synoptic-Pauline-Johannine tradition' (p. 37). Dr. Hodgson objects that 'it is not enough to contrast these two linguistic traditions'; that elements akin to Agape are found outside Christianity; and that 'Dr. Nygren seems not to have realized that our common state is a mixed one, containing elements both of Agape and of Eros' (p. 38, cf. p. 39). These objections, however, are entirely irrelevant. Dr. Nygren is not conducting a piece of linguistic research, and he is fully aware of the facts Dr. Hodgson has mentioned. He is intentionally dealing with a 'specialized use' both of Agape and of Eros, and that with good reason. Despite the differences between them, Agape and Eros have one fundamental thing in common. Both represent a 'heavenly love.' That is to say, both are concerned, each in its own way, with the fundamental question of religion, the question of fellowship with the Eternal, with God. Each claims to be a way of Salvation, a way to fellowship with God. Each forms what Dr. Nygren calls a religious 'fundamental motif'; that is, the constitutive principle of a system of religious life and thought.[1] It is therefore most reasonable to compare and contrast them.

Once this fact is realized, it will prevent us from making other false deductions. It is, for instance, very easy to assume that because Agape is God's love, therefore Eros represents all human love. But it does not; it is a particular form of human love, a highly 'specialized' form. Further, it is false to identify Eros with all 'selfishness,' all forms of human self-seeking and egocentricity. The Neoplatonist is egocentric in his Eros; but the Pharisee is no less egocentric in his attempt to claim a place in the Kingdom of God on the grounds of his own righteousness. Yet Hellenistic Eros religion and the Judaistic religion of the Law are by no means the same thing.

Dr Hodgson's second main contention is that the New Testament is mishandled (p. 40). He alleges that Dr. Nygren contradicts Synoptic evidence in denying that man can have Agape towards God, and the evidence of Johannine literature when he denies that Agape can be predicated of the eternal inner life of the Blessed Trinity.

In the Great Commandment our Lord says:

---

[1] For a brief discussion of the term 'motif,' see Translator's Preface to Part II.

'Thou shalt love (*agapeseis*) the Lord thy God . . .' —therefore, says Dr. Hodgson, man can have Agape towards God. No doubt; but in what sense? It is not enough to repeat words. Here our Lord is clearly speaking of a relation in which man ought to stand towards God. What is this relation? The rest of our Lord's teaching can scarcely leave us in doubt. 'No man can *douleuein* (be the slave of) two masters; for either he will hate the one, and love (*agapesei*) the other. . . .' (Mt $6^{24\text{ff.}}$). There is the sum of the matter. To love God means: to be at God's disposal as a slave is always at his master's disposal, loyal and obedient, and with no concern but that his master's will should be done; and also, to base one's whole existence upon God, to place absolute trust and confidence in Him, and to leave in His hands the ultimate responsibility for everything.[1] Now if that is what Agape towards God means, then Dr. Nygren has never denied that man can have Agape towards God. What he denies is that man can love God in the same sense in which God loves man. Yet he certainly does not argue that 'God is such that our love for him must always be the quest for satisfaction through possession of One pre-eminently desirable' (p. 36). Such love would be Eros love, which 'seeketh only its own' even in God. It is true that man's love for God is always 'caused,' but the cause is not necessarily the equation of God with man's *summum bonum*. 'We love *because* He first loved us.' But *God's* Agape is spontaneous and 'uncaused,' not motivated by anything in us; and unless we are to argue that the relation between man and God should be a fellowship of equals, we can hardly maintain that man can have Agape towards God as God has Agape towards man. But that does not mean that we must identify man's love with Eros.

Dr. Hodgson's next objection is that Dr. Nygren 'regards as a weakness of the Johannine theology what is really one of its most valuable contributions to Christian thought. It . . . clearly presents to us Agape as having its home in the eternal divine life. . . .' (p. 41). But what does Dr. Nygren actually say? With reference to the Johannine teaching on Agape, he writes: 'Its positive significance is that it has taken quite seriously the fact that in His very "essence" God is Agape. . . . God is love not only in relation to sinners. God's love is eternal; before the world began, the Father loved the Son.'[2] He adds that there is a certain danger in this for the idea of Agape. When the love of the Father for the Son is made the prototype of all Agape, there is a risk of our supposing that the Father loves the Son *because* He is the supremely *worthy* object of love, and forgetting that Agape is spontaneous and 'uncaused.' This danger is illustrated by certain traits in Johannine thought. It is significant that in 'John' love for the brethren has replaced love for the neighbour, and that the thought of love for enemies nowhere occurs. Dr. Hodgson, however, seems to think Dr. Nygren holds: 'since Agape is by definition the spontaneous, uncaused love of what is worthless, it cannot be predicated of the eternal, inner life of the blessed Trinity' (p. 40). But Agape does not love *only* what is worthless! It is 'indifferent to value' in the sense that it can and does love the worthy and the unworthy alike; in neither case is it motivated by the worth or lack of worth in its object. When the Father loves the Son, He does so because He is Agape, not because the Son is a worthy object of love.

Dr. Hodgson is aware of the antithesis between self-seeking Eros and self-giving Agape, yet he desires a reconciliation between them. In the 'ideal life' the conflict between them has disappeared, and the lover 'whole-heartedly gives himself in devotion to an object which entirely satisfies him. He does not pursue it because it will satisfy. . . . Nevertheless, the result is satisfaction' (p. 39). The antithesis exists only because of the evil in this world of space and time; in the eternal life of the Trinity it is transcended (p. 40). But this is a strange 'reconciliation.' In fact, Eros has disappeared and given place to Agape. Eros only loves its object because it thinks it will satisfy; it is Agape that loves so as to give itself without regard to its own satisfaction. Agape is not indifferent to the response with which it meets, of course, and given the due response 'the result is satisfaction' no doubt. Doubtless, too, in the 'ideal life' Agape would always meet with such response. Yet even when Agape meets with nothing but rejection, it still goes on loving—a thing which Eros would not do. From the point of view of Eros, Agape is sheer folly; from the point of view of Agape, Eros is one example of 'the evil in this world of space and time,' for it is a very subtle form of sin. Here is no necessary antithesis, only to be reconciled in eternity, but a simple logical and practical contradiction which can only be resolved by the disappearance of either Agape or Eros.

---

[1] See Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum neuen Testament*, i, art. 'Agape,' esp. p. 45.

[2] This is quoted from the Swedish, p. 118. In the English translation a paragraph of 7 lines represents an original 20, and the sentences here quoted have disappeared. Such reduction of the text is unfortunate, and this is not the only instance of it. Even so, Fr. Hebert cannot be fairly accused of *reversing* his author's meaning.

Fr. Hebert also desires a reconciliation between Eros and Agape. He has much to say of the incompatibility of the two ideas, and sees that 'there never has been nor can be a final theological synthesis' between them. Yet he insists that 'a practical reconciliation of the two tendencies . . . is a necessity of life' (p. xv). The reason for this seems to be that he has been guilty of a false identification. He says that Eros and Agape 'represent two tendencies which must be united in Christian theology: God is both Creator and Redeemer' (p. vii); and that the distinction between Eros and Agape is that between Nature and Grace (p. viii). Now it is true that God is both Creator and Redeemer, but it is not true that these aspects are represented by Eros and Agape respectively.

First, Eros cannot represent what Christianity means by the dogma of Creation. It was not Hellenism, but the Bible, which taught us that God is Creator. The God of Hellenistic Eros theory is not a Creator; he is entirely inactive; he sets things in motion 'by being loved'; he himself loves only himself and is sufficient for himself. The nearest approach in Hellenistic thought to the idea of Creation is that of emanation; but emanation and Creation are poles apart. Further, Eros theory always regards this world as at least 'inferior' and 'imperfect,' if not in itself evil. Fr. Hebert is anxious to guard against anything like the Marcionite heresy which delivers the world in which we live into the hands of an evil Demiurge, and regards the 'natural world' as evil (cf. p. xiv). But he can scarcely do this by introducing a conception which is bound up with the inferiority of the sense-world and of the soul as a prisoner in the body from which it longs to escape. And it is useless to reply: 'As Creator, God is the author of the natural world and of human life, with its upward movement which Aristotle describes in terms of Eros' (p. xii). God is the author of the natural world and of human life; but it is as reasonable to say that He is the author of sin as to say that He is the author of the 'upward movement' of Eros—for if God is Agape, then Eros is totally contrary to His nature.

Secondly, when Agape is rightly understood, the question of God as Creator and Redeemer presents no difficulty. Fr. Hebert has fallen into Marcion's own error in limiting the significance of Agape to Redemption alone. That is why he feels the danger of Marcionite conclusions. If we start with Creation and Redemption as two separate ideas we shall have difficulty in uniting them; we shall tend to speak as if there were two Gods, the Creator and the Redeemer, who must somehow be shown to be one. But the Christian Faith knows only one God—the God who has revealed Himself in His 'fullness' in Christ. In Christ we see the essential nature of God, who is both Creator and Redeemer. And what is this nature, this 'fullness,' but Agape? 'God is Agape'; and it is Agape that both creates and redeems. This is of the utmost importance, for if God has really revealed himself at all, then we must interpret His creation in the light of His own revelation of Himself, His nature and purposes. Otherwise we run the grave risk of interpreting 'Nature' by our own light and finding that our interpretation does not agree with what God has revealed. The light that is in us may, after all, be darkness.

'God is Agape.' This is vitally important for our view of the natural world; but it is no less important for our understanding of Agape that God is Creator. Marcion's denial that God is Creator seriously weakens the idea of Agape itself. His God pitied men—who were total 'strangers' to him, and therefore under no obligation to him—because of their misery, caused by the cruel Demiurge-Creator. Our God loves and forgives men—who owe Him everything, yet have rebelled against Him—in spite of their sin.[1] Furthermore, the dogma of Creation is an important bulwark of defence for the Agape motif against Hellenistic Eros piety[2]; and it also bears a certain positive witness in itself to the idea of Agape. In its traditional form as 'Creation *ex nihilo*' it testifies to the spontaneity, the 'uncaused' or unmotivated nature, of the Divine love.

Finally, a word about the term Agape itself. Dr. Nygren uses it in a 'specialized' sense. It has borne other meanings in the course of history,[3] and the reality Dr. Nygren intends it to convey has been signified by other words.[4] Yet his usage has New Testament legitimation, it is peculiarly Christian, and it denotes the very foundation of our Faith: it is God's own love, the 'love of the Cross,' to which we owe both our 'creation, preservation, and all the blessings of this life' and our eternal salvation.

---

[1] Cf. *Agape and Eros*, Pt. II., vol. I, 109–110.

[2] Cf. *op cit.*, 61–62 and 71–72.

[3] *E.g.* Gnosticism degraded it to the lowest level of 'vulgar eros'; *op cit.*, 87 ff.

[4] Cf. *e.g.*, *op. cit.*, 158 n.l.

The Jewish Problem.

By the Reverend Frederic C. Spurr, Hove, Sussex.

The 'Eternal Jew,' often hidden in the mists of history, but always emerging from time to time to make the world aware that he is present, has now become a central figure upon which all eyes are focussed. The 'purge' in Germany and Austria, with its unparalleled brutalities and insults, has outraged the conscience of the entire civilized world, save that enclosed portion which claims to have a monopoly of *Kultur*. Before the unprejudiced conscience of humanity the appalling persecution of the Jews, simply because they are Jews, can have no manner of justification. It may be admitted, and indeed it is admitted by Jews themselves, that certain restrictions upon the activities of a certain type of Jew in Germany were perhaps necessary. There were Jews, unquestionably, who exploited Germany, and cared only for their own profits. (But are there no Britons who treat their own country in a similar way? And no Americans?) If proved offenders had been treated hardly, no voice would have been raised against the action. What has aroused the enlightened conscience of the world is the indiscriminate attack upon an entire people on account of their race; people, also, many of whom are more German than Jew by reason of birth and social service. And tragedy becomes farce when the purge is undertaken under the pseudo-scientific claim of a pure blooded Germany which must not on any account be tainted with a Semitic admixture! How even German anthropologists and historians must be laughing up their sleeves! We begin, therefore, by an expression of the deepest sympathy with a harried and outraged community.

The desperate situation calls for immediate emergency measures, and these are now, happily, being considered, both by many States and, naturally, by the Churches.

Beyond the problem raised immediately, however, there lies an ultimate problem, that of the Jew himself *qua* Jew, and his future. The disposal of the *émigrés* from Germany and Austria, however happily achieved, still leaves the main problem to be faced and settled. For it is a world problem with roots going far back to pre-Christian times. It is becoming acute even in the United States, where, nominally, there is no 'race' question at all. And it is not at all, as so many are fond of saying, a problem that has been raised by Jewish contacts with Christianity. The simple truth is that the Jews have always been disliked from the days of Egypt onwards, and there have been few countries in which their presence has not, sooner or later, been resented. This fact must be taken into account as part of the wider problem, and some answer must be found to the inevitable question, *Why* has this people always been suspected and disliked? There must be some reason for it, other than that of shifting national policies. It is true, alas! that Christendom has, more than once, lent itself to the anti-Christian business of persecuting this race. For such iniquitous work no justification can be offered. Persecution is wholly foreign to the spirit of Him who prayed, 'Father, forgive them, they know not what they do.' Yet there is another side to this story, a side which is frequently overlooked. Very rarely is it recalled that successive Popes entered the most serious protests against the Jew baiting in Spain when the Inquisition was at its height, or that the great Saint Bernard, the most important man in Europe, personally journeyed to Germany to arrest the massacres of Jews. And how many people know that in the Roman Missal the first day of August is set apart for the double commemoration of Saint Peter *ad vincula*, and the Holy Maccabees, those Jews who, under Antiochus were done to death for their fidelity to the faith of their Fathers? If we are to have history at all, let us have it completely. The story of mediæval times is not quite so black as it is often painted by partisans.

The question before us, however, is that of the Jew *to-day*. Whatever has happened in the past, it is the present and the immediate future which are our concern. The approach must be sympathetic, at least for a Christian, for no Christian can be anti-Semitic. He is bound by his faith to respect all men whatever be their race or creed. Yet, with the sympathy, there is need of the clearest thinking.

We may begin by asking what is the charge against the Jew? What are the alleged grounds for disliking him? They may be summarized under one or two heads.

(1) First, it is alleged that he is *arrogant*. He still believes himself to be the 'chosen' of God, the spiritual superior of others. Judaism is declared to be the purest form of religion. With

this, it is said, there also goes the sense of mental superiority. 'The Jew is destined to rule the world.' Sir George Adam Smith (*Syria and the Holy Land*) tells how he visited a Jewish colony in Palestine. The Jews were gambling, while the *fellaheen* were working for them at a low wage. Sir George remarked, 'This could not be the intention in giving them the Holy Land.' And the reply came at once 'Is it not written that the sons of the alien shall be your ploughmen and vinedressers?' The great influx of Jews into Palestine, followed by the success of Tel Aviv—which eclipses Jerusalem—the establishment of a Hebrew University, and the commercial exploitation of the country, has given the Jew a new sense of superiority, so much that one of them could write: 'The 250,000 Jews are of more value than 800,000 Arabs because of our investments.'

It will be seen, therefore, that there is no religious question here at all. Mr. Sidney Dark, in his valuable book on the Jews—largely favourable to them—says, 'The Jew has a superiority complex,' hence he inclines to be arrogant and discourteous.

(2) There is alleged against him an undue influence in the financial world. 'He is a born gambler.' He loves to control money. Generally, he avoids manual labour, whenever possible, and seeks 'money jobs.' He has been the money lender, *par excellence*, and as the courts have often shown, at exorbitant rates of interest.

(3) A third allegation is that of an undue influence in commerce. The cinema is largely in his hands, as also the clothing, tobacco, furniture, jewellery, and fruit businesses. It is said that many of his business methods are underhand, that he does not trade under his own name, that in Britain he adopts a British name to conceal the fact that he is a Jew.

(4) His methods of killing beasts for food are described as 'inhuman.'

(5) He remains aloof from the community in which he has sought refuge, or into which he has been born. His food and his general habits are not those of the people amongst whom he lives. His day for worship is not that of the majority. He can therefore take advantage of the Christian Sunday to pursue his trade to the detriment of those who have to close their establishments on that day.

These are some of the common charges brought against him. They should be proved or withdrawn. So long as they remain in the popular mind they are a source of irritation. It will be observed that in this summary the religious question does not appear. The underlying dislike is due to social and economic reasons. As Mr. Sidney Dark frankly says, 'The Jew is responsible for this suspicion. *He is apart by his own act.*'

We may pass on to inquire, *What does the modern Jew say of himself?* Here we are on surer ground since there is no prejudice at work. During the last five or six years a number of books have poured from the press setting out the Jewish case, and expounding the Jewish ideals. With these also have been produced a number of films for the purpose of propaganda. It is significant that several of the books come from the United States, which has the largest Jewry in the world. The city of New York alone has more than two millions of Jews, a greater number than in the whole of Britain. Four of these books may be selected as typical of the remainder.

In 1934, Messrs. Macmillan published *Judaism as a Civilisation*, by Mordecai M. Kaplan, an ex-Rabbi who left the Synagogue on account of his unorthodoxy. He wrote his book with the avowed purpose of reconciling American-Jewish life. For in the United States the growth of the Jewish community, and its influence in the commercial world has raised the very question (with one difference) which has come to a head in Germany. Mr. Kaplan's main question is, 'Why should Jews endure the inconvenience of remaining Jews in Christian countries?' His book is intended to supply the answer. And it is very significant. 'It is *not*,' he says, 'because of religion.' 'The Jew will not be reduced to the status of a religious denomination.' No! the entire question for Mr. Kaplan is a social one and not religious at all. He himself is not an orthodox Jew, yet he demands his right to remain a Jew. 'Heavenly salvation is not his main interest.' 'The Jews are a distinct *nation*' (*sic*). 'There is a unique Jewish culture.' 'The Jew must in all parts of his life be a Jew.' And he wishes America to accept that: the existence of a separate people who also share the life of America.

A year earlier (1933) Josef Kastein published his *History and Destiny of the Jews*. He also has no place for the religious question. He is frankly rationalistic. Thus: 'It was not God who willed this people and their meaning, but this people who willed this God and the meaning.' . . . Speaking of Palestine he says, 'Palestine was not a gift of God: it was won by war.' The idea of a 'chosen people' vanishes. By the chosen people is meant 'the survival of a people as an *example*.'

. . . Even more truculent is the sentence, 'Judaism has no mission, and has never sent out missionaries.' He makes some rather remarkable admissions, such as, that the Jews themselves were responsible for Rome crushing them. Still more remarkable: 'Christianity was not responsible for the persecution of the Jews . . . it was not true Christianity but *political acts*' (p. 229). Other admissions are equally suggestive. The Jews, he says, came to England only after the Norman Conquest, and their motive was 'attraction by the economic possibilities it held out.' Mr. Kastein seems to have no superiority complex. 'We shall not yield to the temptation to claim for Judaism men of outstanding ability merely because they happen to be Jews.' The entire book, indeed, is in effect a surrender of the whole idea of the 'chosen people.' Yet Mr. Kastein reaches the conclusion that the Jew *qua* Jew is 'a people destined to endure.' But for this he advances no reason whatever. . . .

A decade ago (1924) a Jewish apologia, *Essays of Jewish Life and Thought* appeared in this country. In this composite work little or nothing is made of the religious question. The outlook is almost entirely secular. 'The first duty of man is to make the world a tolerable place to live in, *and only when he has done that* will there be time to turn to the world beyond.' As to religion, it is stated that 'Judaism is not a systematized religion. It has no definite dogmas. *It is really an outlook on life*.' . . . And yet 'Judaism is the purest form of religion,' and 'the Jews are the yeast of the earth.' Here the superiority complex is in evidence, but not in any way as a deduction from any premises supplied by the authors of the volume.

Laurie Magnus, in *Jews and the Christian Era* (1929), sums up his conclusions in a practical sentence: 'Christianity is in debt to the Jews for the Old Testament,' *therefore* 'Jews should share lavishly in the fruits of the civilization they helped to sow.' Here the outlook is frankly materialistic: heavy interest for their comparatively small share of the Capital.

To these four typical books of their class may be added a fifth, published in 1937—*The Jew in Revolt*, by William Zukerman, an American journalist. His book has not been favourably received by Jewry. We must allow for a certain hysteria in its pages, and also for certain exaggerations. It is the facts he presents which are so challenging. He has no love for Zionism, which, he considers, is politically minded rather than religiously minded. And he traces many of the present troubles in Palestine to the speculators in real estate and building, who in 1924–5 forced a financial boom which harmed the country. Economically they formed the most decadent class in Jewry (p. 149). For them business and commerce were to take the place of work on the land. Palestine was to become the business centre of the near East, and was to awaken that part of the world to the glories of Capitalism (p. 151). 'The entire middle-class period in Palestine, 1924–1936, was permeated with the rush and push, grab and keep spirit of this class; its ultimate purpose being *not* to change Jewry and make it fit for a new type of life in Palestine, but *to change Palestine* and make it a suitable refuge for the Jewish middle classes' (p. 152). And so they 'turned Palestine into a restless, predominantly commercial and financial centre with all the artificiality of industrialism in its decay' (p. 153). And he concludes that 'if the present régime continues it will imperil Judaism all over the world.'

Zukerman's book needs reading with caution. The opinions and the facts he adduces must be sharply separated. But it should be read all the same.

These five revealing books tell us a great deal concerning the modern Jew and his relation to the rest of the world. They make it clear that the Jew, as such, has no *exceptional* contribution to make to *religion*, for the reason that he has no special religion; nothing in fact that is not found in Islam, and in a richer form in Christianity. For the orthodox Jew religion does not advance beyond the Old Testament. But the orthodox Jew is in a minority in the advanced countries. American Jewry is, in the main, more divided than are the great Protestant denominations. 'Liberal' Judaism has in effect abandoned Mosaism and much of the Old Testament. Many Jews have become Theosophists, Eddyites, and Spiritualists. It is said that in New York 80,000 Jews have left the Synagogue for the Eddy cult. It would appear, therefore, from modern Jewish writings that there is nothing left in Judaism, on its religious side, that in any way is exceptional.

But what of the cultural claim? It is here that the Jew advances his special rights. There are some great Jewish names in science, literature, and medicine. But Mr. Kastein will not claim these as possessing outstanding ability 'because they happen to be Jews,' but for quite other reasons, such as the milieu in which they are found, and the culture with which others have enriched them.

For the Jew *qua* Jew has created no civilization. Greece and Rome bequeathed to the world great memorials, the Jew has bequeathed none. His contributions to literature and science are comparatively rare. 'He comes late into the field which others have sown.' The great names of science are non-Jewish: Watt, Stephenson, Marconi, Pasteur, Edison, Galileo, Newton, Oliver Lodge, Jeans. The great names in literature, art, and philosophy are non-Jewish: Michael Angelo, Dante, Tasso, Descartes, Kant, Shakespeare, Goethe. And also in music: Joachim, the famous violinist himself a Jew, deplored the fact that there had never been a Jewish composer of the first rank. Meyerbeer and Offenbach are not comparable with Palestrina, Bach, Beethoven, Wagner, Mozart, and Elgar.

It would not seem, therefore, that there is any justification for the notion that there resides in Judaism a native superiority which gives it the right to claim exceptional privileges. We may rather sympathize with Isaac Disraeli who left the synagogue because 'it cuts Jews off from the great family of mankind.'

These conclusions, which are drawn from Jewish admissions, certainly do not err on the side of sentiment. If they appear to be drastic, the responsibility for this belongs to those who have practically renounced the specific Jewish claim. In the last analysis, therefore, we are left with the Jew as an individual: an alien, a wanderer, who, having no country of his own, has settled in Christian countries, yet who, as Mr. Sidney Dark says, 'remains apart by *his own act*.' It is this fact which constitutes the Jewish problem. *And the problem can only be solved by the Jew himself.* As a religious person he has the right to his own form of worship, and also the right of protection wherever he settles. To persecute him for his religious convictions is unjust and contemptible. But as a *racial* person he must make up his mind whether he will remain apart, or assimilate with others. If he insists on remaining racially apart, then he must find a country of his own. He cannot remain a separate nation within another nation. A return to the Ghetto is impossible. There remains Palestine. But that country is not large enough to contain the whole of Jewry. Besides, the majority of Jews do not want to live in Palestine. Zionism is a minority movement. Further, the Jew has no greater right to Palestine than has the Arab, who outnumbers him. Yet he is practically claiming that right which, however, is forbidden by the Mandate. The present clash in Palestine is due entirely to this cause. It is not a question of Islam *versus* Judaism. It is a question of a new race seeking to dominate an older one.

The alternative to this is for the Jew to renounce all national and racial claims, and to share completely the life of the people amongst whom he has found refuge. In a word, to be absorbed socially. Mr. H. G. Wells in his *Shape of Things to Come* visualized this as the ultimate solution. If the Jew has no exceptional religion to maintain, and no exceptional culture to offer, then why should he continue to remain apart? For him to be absorbed would be no more than has happened to Britain and Germany and other peoples during the centuries. And the experiment is now being tried in the United States which accepts all nationalities, and aims ultimately at creating one nation out of them all.

But the Jew must *share completely* the life of the people amongst which he dwells. He must take his share of all the tasks, pleasant and unpleasant, and cease to specialize in finance and trading. For originally the Jew was neither trader nor financier. He was an agriculturalist. He has developed trade and finance in the course of history, and largely through circumstances. But the conditions to-day are wholly changed and it is neither necessary nor desirable that one race should continue to dominate finance or certain industries. The Jew has no native 'genius' for these things. They are largely accidental to him, and the goodwill and peace of the world depend upon a practical recognition of this fact. If the Jew will abandon his exclusiveness and arrogance and belief in his own superiority and throw himself into the common life of the world, he will solve the entire problem. If he refuses, then friction is bound to continue and develop.

Meanwhile, the Church must find a new way of approach to the Jew, for the question on our side is more than political or social; it is eminently religious. Christian Britain has been very kind to the Jew. It has given him asylum, broken down all barriers to his progress, and offered him many honours. And the best type of Jew is changing his attitude towards Christianity. The ancient hate and acrimoniousness are dying. Jews no longer spit at the mention of the name of Jesus. Mr. John Cournos' book (1938), *Hear, O Israel*, is a remarkable evidence of this. He makes a powerful plea to his co-religionists to recover the Jesus whom, he says, they have misunderstood. He even admits the supremacy of Jesus. 'To me the Jewish Bible without Jesus is as unthinkable as it would be without Moses. . . . Moses *inevitably led to Jesus*.'

The whole book is keyed to this note. Yet Mr. Cournos wants a purely Jewish Christ. And he would get rid of S. Paul and all Christian theology. It is the Jesus of history, with his temporal limitations that he desires. 'Jews to remain Jews must take up their culture *where they left off* nineteen centuries ago.' It is a remarkable admission, but it is retrograde for all that. Still, that a Jew who believes that his race is still the 'chosen people,' should go so far as he has done, is highly significant. There is a new openness of mind, and a movement in the Unitarian direction which hold much promise. And on the Christian side the modern attitude towards Old Testament prophecy offers a new approach through the medium of the ancient writings. Christianity can only win over the best kind of Jew, as Christians show in their lives that their faith is dynamically superior to any other, and that Christianity is not the destruction of the core of the Jewish faith, but its natural and Divine fulfilment. The older methods of Jewish evangelization are no longer possible, but the double change in the higher Jewish outlook, and in the better Christian understanding of progressive revelation, give us a new basis for trying to solve the age-long riddle of the Jew.

Literature.

A FINE COMMENTARY ON FIRST CORINTHIANS.

An outstanding work of the moment is Dr. James Moffatt's Commentary on the *First Epistle to the Corinthians* in the Moffatt New Testament Commentary (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net). It is not only an invaluable aid to the study of the Epistle, but is also at the same time a work of considerable theological importance as an exposition of St. Paul's thought. The apt illustrations from ancient and modern writers which we have learnt to expect in Dr. Moffatt's writings reappear in this volume, together with illuminating extracts from missionary literature. The book can also be read as a devotional manual, and a preacher who knows his way will find it full of attractive suggestions.

The Introduction is brief but it adequately covers the important points. Dr. Moffatt explains when and why the Epistle was written, and gives a vivid picture of Corinth and of the conditions which obtained in the Corinthian Church. He also discusses the question of the unity of the Epistle, and adds an interesting section on its significance as a Christian writing. On the whole, his judgment is in favour of accepting the Epistle as a literary whole. He is well alive to the possibility that 6^{12-20} 7^{17-24} 10^{1-22} and 11^{2-34} may originally have belonged to the 'first' letter to the Corinthians (cf. 1 Co 5^{9}), along with 2 Co 6^{14}–7^{1}, but his opinion is that the reconstructions ably advocated by Johannes Weiss and M. Goguel 'are not quite convincing.'

Interesting and important as such discussions are, the most valuable part of Dr. Moffatt's work lies in the Commentary proper. To this task he brings wide knowledge, sound critical judgment, and deep religious insight. We have marked many passages which deserve repeated study, especially those concerned with such topics as St. Paul's use of 'Body' and 'the Body,' the Last Supper and the Lord's Supper, Speaking with Tongues, and 'Maranatha.' Many *obiter dicta* challenge attention, as, for example, Dr. Moffatt's claim that St. Paul was not disillusioned by his Athenian experience, his contention that the 'ransom-passage' in Mk 10^{45} is 'one of the most self-authenticating in the record,' and his submission that an incidental remark like that in 7^{10} 'tells against the notion that gifted men in the primitive communities felt inspired to produce, by a free use of their devout imagination, sayings of the Lord to suit the requirements of the cult' (p. 80). We are particularly impressed by his careful study of the meaning of important Greek words in the Epistle, notably in the noble hymn to Love in ch. 13, and by his admirable exegesis of such passages as $7^{10f.\ 34.\ 36-8}$ $10^{16f.}$ $11^{16.\ 23-34}$ $13^{3.\ 12f.}$ $15^{24.\ 29.\ 51}$ 16^{22}. Here and there he does not carry us with him, as, for example, in his treatment of 4^{6} and in his suggestion that the Galatian contribution to the Apostolic Collection appears to have been independently transmitted to Jerusalem (p. 272; cf. Ac 20^{4}: 'Gaius of Derbe and Timothy'). These, however, are small points where students differ and will continue to differ. It is safe to say that henceforward no one will dream of making a careful study of 1 Co without taking into constant consideration Dr.

Moffatt's Commentary. A more signal mark of his achievement is that he has written a book which is so simply and directly expressed that the general reader, as well as the professed student, will be able to read it with profit and delight.

THE PHENOMENOLOGY OF RELIGION.

In 1925 Dr. G. van der Leeuw, Professor of the History of Religions in the University of Groningen, published an 'Introduction to the Phenomenology of Religion.' In 1933 he followed it up with a larger book bearing the title in the German original of 'Phänomenologie der Religion.' This latter work is now before us in an English translation—*Religion in Essence and Manifestation* (Allen and Unwin; 25s. net). The translator, Mr. J. E. Turner, M.A., Ph.D., Reader in Philosophy in the University of Liverpool, has himself published several notable constructive works in the sphere of theistic thought, and has now laid us under a great debt by his patient and effective rendering of van der Leeuw's seven hundred page work.

The work before us has been compared by the translator to William James's 'Varieties of Religious Experience,' and the comparison is not unjust; but van der Leeuw, whose work is much larger than William James's, deals more elaborately with social anthropology and primitive religion (in which he is an acknowledged master), and lays more emphasis than does William James on the historical as distinguished from the psychological, on 'manifestation' as distinguished from 'essence.'

The work under review is divided into five unequal parts, the largest of which are the first and the third. Part I. treats of the Object of Religion (which is, from the author's standpoint, the subject in the sense of 'the active and primary Agent in the situation'). Here vast learning is brought to the presentation of that field of early belief and custom with which writers like Tylor, Robertson Smith, Sir James G. Frazer, and Dr. R. R. Marett have familiarized English readers. Our author is not, however, so much concerned to uphold theory as to set forth fact.

Part II. turns to the Subject of Religion, and treats of the sacred man, the sacred community, and the soul (the sacred within man). While Phenomenology describes how man conducts himself in relation to Power, it must not be forgotten that man himself first decides, or alters, his attitude after he has been affected by Power, which is 'the active and primary Agent.' 'In this all believers are unanimous, from primitive man who experiences the nearness of Power and calls out "Tabu!" to the apostle who exhorts us to love God because He "first loved us."'

Part III. deals with Object and Subject in their Reciprocal Operation, which takes the forms of outward action (sacrifice, sacrament, festival, myth, prayer, praise, etc.) and inward action (religious experience in all its various phases). To glance only at the chapter on Mysticism is to gain an immediate impression of the comprehensiveness and concreteness of van der Leeuw's method of treatment. Here, as throughout the work, Christianity receives an illuminating setting in the history and psychology of religion.

Part IV. treats of the World, the ways to it of domination and obedience, and the goals of it, man, the world itself, and God. Part V. treats of Forms, whether religions or founders. Here there is an interesting and elaborate classification of religions, which owes its impulse to Hegel's famous classification according to historic types. Christianity is here regarded as the central form of historical religions, and its typology as needing only one word, Love. 'This is because, in Christianity, God's activity and the reciprocal activity of man are essentially the same: the movement of Power towards the world is love, while that of the world towards God is reciprocal love; no other word is available.'

When in his treatment of founders our author passes from the founder, the reformer, the teacher, the philosopher, the theologian, and the example, to reach at length the mediator, he indicates that he has come to the borderland of Phenomenology. The phenomenologist cannot perceive where and how the mediator enters history. 'At this point the contemplative and comprehending servant of research reverently withdraws; his own utterance yields place to that of proclamation, his service to that in the sanctuary.'

'WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE NIGHT?'

Under this title we propose to direct attention to a group of recent publications which deal with various aspects of the world-situation. They have this in common that all are well-informed, and all are challenging. The most deliberately provocative is *The Christian Challenge to Christians*, by Mr. Kenneth Ingram (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net). It is a sequel to the author's 'Christianity—Right or Left.' Mr. Ingram writes with clarity and force. One may here and there detect a slight exaggeration, but is there not a kind of prophetic licence to exaggerate? His view is that Fascism is the last desperate effort of Capitalism to survive, and his condemnation of Capitalism with its product of chronic unemployment is very thorough. He is equally convinced that only on a Christian basis and with Christian principles can a better and permanent civilisation be reared; and a good portion of the book is an 'apologetic' for Christian Faith which, although slight and sometimes too facile will, we hope, make an impression on the church-less class which it is Mr. Ingram's aim to reach.

Next we commend very cordially a book, *Cross and Swastika*, by Dr. Arthur Frey, with Introduction by Karl Barth (S.C.M.; 6s. net). The translation has been very ably done by J. Strathearn M'Nab. Here we get an authoritative and strictly objective account of the struggle of the German Evangelical Church against a Government suppression which aims in Barth's words 'to make the Church powerless, defenceless, even speechless.' The book shows, unhappily, that we must dismiss from our minds any pleasing illusions that in Germany the worst is past for the Church. Yet the book is not one meant to depress. The author's conviction is everywhere plain that the Church, an anvil which has worn out many hammers in the past, will wear out this one also.

Similar is the faith of the Rev. James Barr, B.D., M.P., who has compiled a pamphlet, *Religious Liberty in the Totalitarian States*, with the sub-title 'The Challenge to the Church of Communism, Fascism, Nazism' (Allenson; 6d. net). It is a useful collection of authoritative statements, and is written with the author's characteristic vigour. It is not quite clear why a chapter vindicating John Wesley against a charge of delaying social reform should be included, but it has its own interest.

Then we have a work by Sir Norman Angell, *Peace with the Dictators?* (Hamish Hamilton; 7s. 6d. net). Sir Norman's books require no 'boost'; long ago his name became sufficient guarantee of a book's value. Unlike the other works here mentioned, this one has no direct reference to religion. The problems of our time are discussed just as political problems. Sir Norman has his own very definite views, but few writers can exhibit such understanding of the other side. This is proved afresh in this volume, which opens with a one-man symposium in which Sir Norman sets forth with understanding the positions of a Fascist and a Nazi, and answers as a typical Englishman. Then we have a brief but penetrating criticism of Pacifism. Then a detailed examination of the situation which confronts British statesmanship, a criticism of its failures, and a forecast of the results of various alternatives. The way of safety, he holds, is that Britain must show that 'the purpose of her power is not monopolisation, but a widening of economic opportunity' for others as well as herself. Nations which value freedom must combine to make a single unit of their power not 'to maintain a situation which crystallizes inequality of right; it must offer to those against whom it arms the same rights of independence, freedom, peace, economic opportunity, which it is formed to defend.'

ZOROASTRIAN RELIGION.

This little book, *The Religion of the Good Life: Zoroastrianism*, by R. P. Masani, M.A. (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net), to which the Principal of the Wilson College, Bombay, contributes a Foreword, is welcome as drawing attention to one of the most interesting and least known of the non-Christian religions. Among all the great, living religions Zoroastrianism has the smallest following, but few as the Parsis are they have qualities that may well arouse interest in the religion that has helped to make them what they are. If any one desires to satisfy that interest we can agree with Dr. M'Kenzie when he says that 'for those who are not specialists but who wish to know more regarding Parsi ways of life and thought, this is certainly the book.'

The distinctive characteristic of the faith here expounded is suggested by its description as 'the Religion of the Good Life.' 'Resist evil,' Mr. Masani tells us, 'is the Zoroastrian battle-cry.' This is a well-grounded claim and marks off this religion from its great neighbour, Hinduism, one with it in its origin and yet ultimately so radically diverse from it. Along with this high quality goes, in Mr. Masani's view, what he calls 'the uncompromising monotheistic character of the creed as preached by the sage of Iran.' This some would hesitate to accept as true of this religion, and Mr. Masani himself admits that in later times Zoroastrianism became a dualism. But as his words just quoted indicate, it is the religion of the Gathas that here and throughout most of his book Mr. Masani is expounding. He is well aware that that ancient faith has become sadly corrupted. When J. H. Moulton visited India twenty years ago he gave himself with eager enthusiasm to the task of recalling the Parsis to the teaching of their own great prophet, for, he said, 'the better a Parsi understands Zoroaster's doctrine and the more faithfully he strives to order his life according to his ideals, the nearer he comes to Christ and to the God and Father of us all.' Mr. Masani's book may well have the same effect.

The reading of this book suggests a question. Dr. H. Kraemer, in his recent notable exposition of 'The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World,' divides the religions of the world into two classes, 'prophetic religions of revelation' and 'naturalist religions of trans-empirical realization.' The former are Christianity, Judaism, and Islam, and the latter all the others. Where does Zoroastrianism belong? It has no historical affinity with the three of the former class, but arises in a wholly alien environment. Was it not, nevertheless, a prophetic religion of revelation? J. H. Moulton and Archbishop Söderblom would say that it was.

CODEX SINAITICUS.

In studying the great ancient copies of the Bible we feel that every detail is important. Probably the greatest and most careful of all authorities on this subject was Tischendorf, and the famous Codex Sinaiticus, which he himself discovered, was to him the most valuable document in the world. He gave it more thorough and careful attention than he bestowed on any other MS., and numbers of other scholars since his time have checked and revised his observations. Yet there is still more to be said, and the British Museum experts have been able to subject it to a fresh examination, using means (such as ultra-violet light in photography) which were not at Tischendorf's disposal. They have recorded the results of their investigations in a sumptuous volume, *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus*, by Mr. H. J. M. Milne and Mr. T. C. Skeat, including contributions by Mr. Douglas Cockerell (British Museum; 32s. 6d.), which shows that it was well worth while for this country to procure the MS. They have dealt with such matters as the original size of the MS., the extent of the lost portions, the identity of the various scribes who worked on it, the method of its production—visual copying or dictation—and its date and place of origin. Naturally they have not been able to produce any startling new hypothesis on any of these points, but it is valuable to have the accepted views confirmed and corrected in detail. Sometimes valuable new light has been thrown on certain problems. For instance, it has always been recognized that when the MS. was first written it did not include the last verse of the Gospel according to St. John. Evidently the original colophon had been erased, and the missing words added over it later. It is now clear that this was the work of the original scribe of this portion, who himself corrected what he believed to have been his mistake. The relations between the Codex Sinaiticus and two other great MSS., Vaticanus and Alexandrinus, are also discussed, and appendices give useful information regarding them. There is an interesting account of the rebinding of the MS. by the Museum experts, and the volume contains over twenty figures and more than forty plates. The former are, for the most part, photographs of parts of the text illustrating the points discussed; the latter are facsimiles of colophons in the Codex Vaticanus and the Codex Alexandrinus. The whole work has been beautifully produced, and forms a volume worthy of its subject.

THE PSALMS CHRONOLOGICALLY TREATED.

The exposition of the Psalms is probably the most difficult task which faces the Old Testament scholar; it is a deplorable fact that there is in English no satisfactory modern work on the Psalter. The newest work on the subject is a volume by the American scholar, Moses Buttenwieser—*The Psalms Chronologically Treated* (Cambridge University Press; 22s. 6d. net)—well known for his studies in the prophets and other parts of the Bible. He brings to his task a deep interest in the subject and a wide range of knowledge, though he has hardly been affected by recent European studies. The work of Kittel, Gunkel, and Hans Schmidt has had little influence on him, and we look in vain for any serious appreciation of the established principles of Hebrew poetic form. Even parallelism, which can be so effectively employed in exegesis, is practically ignored. The author has not shaken himself free from the method of treatment, whose best exponent was Ewald, which sought to assign more or less definite dates to individual Psalms. In any case, such an attempt must be largely subjective, and few readers, if any, will follow Buttenwieser when he uses his conjectures as an assured basis for the reconstruction of history, especially of the periods in the post-exilic age of which we know very little. The position becomes more precarious still when we observe the wholesale re-organization of some Psalms, and the arbitrary dissection and synthesis which have made his conclusions possible. It may be freely admitted that most of the Psalms have been considerably modified in the course of their history, succeeding generations adapting them to their peculiar needs, but changes made for this purpose would hardly have been those which Buttenwieser constantly assumes, and the attempt to recover the original forms by purely subjective methods must always be precarious. An extreme illustration meets us at the very beginning of the book. The author is struck by resemblances between parts of Ps 68 and the Song of Deborah. He therefore reconstructs a Psalm—' 68B '—and ascribes it to the poet of Jg 5. The Psalm thus recovered consists of the following verses: 8, 9*a-b*, 9β, 9α, 16–18, 12–13, 14*b*, 15, 19*a–b*, 25–28, 14*a*. There will, also, be strong divergences of opinion on the literary merit of different Psalms; not many readers would assent to the description of Ps 103 as the work of a ' minor poet,' an ' inferior writer,' who is guilty of ' slipshod imitation of other writers, in the manner characteristic of a plagiarist,' even though it is clear that he made use of the work of other poets. At times we even suspect the writer of failing to appreciate some of the finer points of Hebrew grammar, though there is a very sound and valuable Excursus in the Introduction which deals with the Precative Perfect. Buttenwieser here has called attention to an important point which, as he says, is too often overlooked, in spite of the familiar parallel idiom in Arabic.

EDWYN CLEMENT HOSKYNS.

A volume of sermons delivered in the chapel of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, by the late Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, Bart., M.C., D.D., has been published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge under the title *Cambridge Sermons* (6s. net). The sermons are preceded by a biographical sketch from the hands of ' Charles Smyth,' but, as his name is not on the title-page, we are not informed about his identity. We gather that he was a disciple and friend of Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, and in any case, the biography is both intimate and interesting. No one who remembers the shock of pleasure and enlightenment he received from ' The Riddle of the New Testament,' Hoskyns' best known work, will be disposed to deny him a large and influential place in the development of New Testament scholarship. And we can sympathize with the strain of eulogy that pervades this friendly tribute. It is in this sympathetic spirit that we read the first sentence in it: ' For many of my generation . . . the two outstanding names in the history of Christian thought in England in the present century are those of G. K. Chesterton and Sir Edwyn Hoskyns'; and this sentence later on, ' His essay on " The Christ of the Synoptic Gospels " in *Essays Catholic and Critical* may be said to have marked, chronologically, the turning of the tide in the study of New Testament Theology in England'; and, finally, ' it may be said of him that no man has done more to familiarize the Church of England with the vitally important developments in Biblical theology in Germany in recent times.'

These are large claims, and they may at any rate be accepted as reflecting the estimate of Hoskyns which prevailed in Cambridge circles. And it is certain that he was a considerable figure in contemporary theology. The sermons included in this volume are divided into five series, the two most important being the first on ' Eschatology' and the second on ' Sin.' Both series are marked by the same qualities—competent scholarship, spiritual earnestness, and decided convictions. They are definitely university sermons, addressed to students, for the most part essays rather than sermons. But they are by no means dry or merely ' scholarly.' The deep religious motive in the preacher informs them all. We can trace the two master forces that helped to mould the preacher's thinking, that of Schweitzer and that of Barth. Hoskyns had a good deal of the former's devout simplicity, and not a little of the latter's dogmatic fervour. But he was not dominated by either. The secret of his life was his own definite faith, and his masters only helped to give it direction.

We can cordially commend a book by an American writer, Mr. Albert Edward Day—*God in us: We in God* (Abingdon Press; $1.75). It consists of five chapters: The God of Experience, The Experience of God, The Jesus of Experience, The Experience of Jesus, and Religious Experience—An Appraisal, and they are all good. The main point of the book seems to be that people have a very real experience of God if they will only recognize it. In the first chapter the writer exhibits the different ways in which God makes Himself known. We have seldom seen this better done. Mr. Day is not an obscurantist. He knows what can be said against the religious point of view, and states it. But his own faith is clear and well grounded. And his book will give real help to any who wish to know what can be said in reply to the criticisms of current scepticism.

In *The Savage and His Totem*, by Mr. P. Hadfield, M.A. (Allenson; 5s. net), we have a well-documented account of Totemism and of its distribution. Dr. Denney said of Frazer's 'Golden Bough' that it nearly killed him, and one would welcome any less bewildering road to a knowledge of the vast subject of primitive practices and their significance. Such a handbook as this may be of some help. One does not expect in a compendium graces of style and certainly one does not get them here. On the first page we find this sentence, 'What we call Totemism might be described as a distinct species of animal, plant, or inanimate object to which a group of people pay reverence.' This might be better expressed.

The Rev. J. Warren, B.D. (Dublin), discusses in a pamphlet issued by Messrs. James Clarke & Co., the subject of *Our Alleged Debt to Rome for the Bible.* The pamphlet is reprinted from 'The Evangelical Quarterly' for the Scottish Reformation Society. The tenor of the discussion, which is learned and vigorous, may be gathered from the concluding sentence: 'Had not God in mercy sent us the Reformation, and enabled the Reformers to strive and suffer, would He have had a people of His, gratefully and adoringly holding His blessed Book in their hands, to-day?'

That Roger Bacon was a noteworthy man in his day most people are aware, but few know the real facts about either the man or his work. For that they have scarcely been to blame. Now, however, Mr. F. Winthrop Woodruff has given us all a chance to learn. His *Roger Bacon* (James Clarke; 5s. net) sets forth in very readable form all that is known of this thinker who, we may say, just missed the scientific path, but pointed the way towards it.

The recently founded University of London Institute of Archæology, under the Directorship of Dr. R. E. M. Wheeler, and the Secretaryship of Miss Kathleen Kenyon, M.A., has issued its *First Annual Report, 1937*, consisting of seventy-two pages. The Annual Reports are intended to contain a résumé of developments and work done during the preceding year, and to give from time to time summaries of lectures of outstanding general interest. They will not contain accounts of research work, as these will be published in the form of special papers or monographs. The present Report gives an interesting account of the opening of the Institute by the Earl of Athlone, K.G., Chancellor of the University, a description of the Headquarters' building (formerly St. John's Lodge), a report of the routine work for 1937, a detailed statement of the study-collections (which include those of Sir Flinders Petrie), a report on the department of Geochronology, and an important public lecture by C. F. C. Hawkes, F.S.A., on current British Archæology. Altogether this First Report is a praiseworthy one. The Institute is really a laboratory of archæological science, wherein the archæologist of the future may learn the essentials of his business, and as its scope includes the Near East as well as Britain it should prove of interest to Biblical students who desire materials for study, instruction in the treatment of antiquities, and training in archæological method. The Report is published by the Institute, which is located at Inner Circle, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1.

The White Lectures, delivered in St. Paul's Cathedral on the Wednesdays in Lent, were this year all concerned with the Bible. The Lecturers included Dean Inge, the Rev. Anthony C. Deane, and Dr. W. R. Matthews. Dean Inge's subject was 'What England owes to the Bible'; Dr. Matthew's subject was 'The Bible and the Living Word of God.' It will easily be imagined that in such hands these subjects were adequately dealt with. It is extraordinary how fresh men, with such furnished minds, can be on topics so often written on. *Our English Bible* is the title of the booklet which contains the six lectures. The publishers are Longmans, and the price is 2s. 6d. net.

A volume of interesting and suggestive essays on aspects of religion and life has been published by Messrs. Maclehose & Co., *The Courage to be Real*, by the Rev. Geoffrey Allen (5s. net). Mr. Allen's name is associated with a well-known book, 'Tell John,' and in his new work he has given us something in its own way quite as stimulating. The Essays are disconnected so far as their subjects are concerned. 'Grace and Truth,' 'The Kingdom,' 'Growth,' 'Fear,' 'The Love of Money,' 'The Crowd,' 'Evangelism,' 'Missions,' and 'God,' are the titles. But there is an underlying continuity because of the way in which the writer thinks of everything. The main message of the book is that everything is of grace, and that grace produces truth, reality, and the courage to be real. Mr. Allen makes skilful use of the conclusions of modern psychology, and he acknowledges a modified debt to the Oxford Group. But he is essentially independent, and, while deeply rooted in the essentials of the gospel, he maintains a broad, human outlook on life and truth. These essays will repay careful consideration.

One of the most striking of modern contributions to the study of the Old Testament is Professor S. H. Hooke's theory of a 'ritual pattern,' characteristic of almost all forms of religion in the ancient Near East. The main outlines were sketched in his contributions to 'Myth and Ritual' and elsewhere, and he has now developed the theme still further in his Schweich Lectures, *The Origins of Early Semitic Ritual* (Milford; 6s. net). The first of the three is devoted to an account of early Mesopotamian ritual, with special stress on the death and the marriage of the god. The second lecture is given up to a discussion of Canaanite ritual, for which our two main sources of information are the Ras Shamra documents and the Old Testament. The third gathers together the material and applies it to a study of Israelite cults. While Professor Hooke has propounded no fresh theory, he has shown even more clearly than before the basis on which his views rest, and has given us a straightforward statement of a position which it will not be easy to refute. A number of plates add to the interest of a book which will take a significant place in Old Testament studies.

The Episcopal Church in the United States has a 'Forward Movement' on hand, and the Bishop of Southern Ohio, Chairman of the Movement's Commission, has preached a sermon on it which is published as the 'Hale Memorial' sermon, *The Forward Movement in the Episcopal Church* (Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Illinois). The burden of the sermon is that we shall go forward spiritually mainly by the faithful use of the means of grace in our possession. This is urged with earnestness and ability.

A beautiful little book, intended for those who have just been confirmed, is compiled by the Rev. D. E. W. Harrison, M.A., and the Rev. S. F. Allison, M.A.—*The Christian Life* (S.P.C.K.; 1s. and 1s. 6d. net). It is divided into three parts; first, the meaning of the Christian faith and its implications for life; second, the aids to Christian living (Prayer, Bible Reading, and Holy Communion); and third, the Communion Service, with suggestions for the communicant's use. This is an admirable book to put into the hands of one who has just taken on himself the responsibilities of full Church membership. It contains real help where help is most needed.

In his recent volume, *Did Christ Really Live?* (S.C.M.; 5s. net), Dr. H. G. Wood discusses what is now for students of theology an old and familiar question, but a question which may still be a source of trouble to some minds. The task he sets before him is to examine by the standards of historical enquiry the case presented by those who deny the historicity of Jesus. He asks first how they account for the rise of Christianity when they have set the historical Jesus aside. In this connection he considers two propositions put forward as fundamental by J. M. Robertson in his 'Pagan Christs.' One is that the Gospel story of the Last Supper, the Agony, the Betrayal, the Crucifixion, and the Resurrection is originally a mystery-drama; the other, that the mystery-drama was an evolution from a Palestinian rite of human sacrifice, and was associated with an ancient pre-Christian cult of a hero-god called Jesus or Joshua. It is the merit of Dr. Wood's book that he examines and refutes these two propositions in detail, incidentally showing his own close acquaintance with the relevant literature; but, despite his attempt to blunt the edge of this criticism, we cannot help feeling that a later work in this field of the Christ-Myth theory might well have been selected for discussion than one written so far back as 1903. Dr. Wood concludes his book by considering the questions: What is the religious significance of the historicity of Jesus? And what do we know about the historic Christ? He contends that a historical Jesus is a richer and fuller revelation of love than a myth, however beautiful; and that, try as we may, we cannot get Jesus out of history.

Prayer and the Social Revolution, by John S. Hoyland (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net), is written from the standpoint of one who has been driven by his experience in the distressed areas to a definite socialist standpoint. But the author is not a materialist, nor does he share the extreme Marxian view of history. He is an ardent Christian and as ardent a believer in prayer. One great advantage in the present-day swinging of the world towards dictatorships, he says, is that we know by name for whom we should pray. And prayer is needed not so much for peoples or legislatures but concentrated on a few statesmen who control policies. It is a cry for the altering of the spirit of these men. Mr. Hoyland longs for the social revolution that will bring justice to the dispossessed. But he looks for this to prayer that puts our wills at the disposal of the Will of God. After stating his position he follows with a detailed exposition of the Lord's Prayer. This is a fine book, intellectually and spiritually. Whatever your economic opinions may be, you will find here real enlightenment.

The Joint-Committee of Anglican and Free-Churchmen which has been conducting 'Conversations' about Church union for some years issued lately an 'Outline of a Reunion Scheme,' and the Rev. Hugh Martin has, by request of the Committee, written a brief commentary on it. His purpose is to explain the scheme, to emphasize its most important features, to point out the issues of greatest difficulty and to suggest how these can be met. He has gone over the scheme point by point, and, with a remarkable breadth of mind and a clear grasp of essentials, he commends the scheme to the consideration of the members of the churches. This little pamphlet, *Can We Unite?* (S.C.M.; 6d.) should be read and carefully considered by all interested in such a notable adventure. And who is not?

Fascism in the English Church, by a London Journalist (Henry E. Walter, London; 2s. 6d. net), is an 'exposure' of the errors to which the writer thinks the Church of England is giving itself up. Romanism and Rationalism are destroying the Church, which is being dominated by a dictatorship of the clergy. The 'Low' Church is being snuffed out. Very few of its ministers are asked to broadcast, or to serve on commissions. Romish practices are being foisted on congregations. What is wanted, the journalist thinks, is propaganda by the people who object to all this. The writer is very much in earnest, and he gives his alarms an up-to-date form by deft journalistic touches.

The volume of essays recently published in memory of Linda R. Miller contains an article by Professor Solomon Zeitlin on *The Pharisees and the Gospels*, which is available in separate form. The problem of the relations between Pharisaism and the Early Church is still far from being solved. On the one hand, we have the undeniable fact that the two had a great deal in common, and on the other the equally undeniable fact that the Pharisees of Jesus' day were bitterly hostile to Him. Professor Zeitlin's contribution to the study of the question is to take the teaching of Jesus, especially from the Sermon on the Mount, and show that it was concerned with the practical ethic of the individual, while the Pharisaic pronouncements as seen in the Mishnah and other parts of the Talmud dealt with the administration of public law. The charge of hypocrisy brought against the Pharisees by Jesus (according to the Biblical text) he explains as a later insertion in the Gospels, pointing to the use of the term Rabbi as another illustration of the tendency to insert later words and phrases into the story. Even if the main contention of the essay does not meet with general approval, it contains interesting exegeses of some New Testament passages, and its sympathetic tone is very welcome.

◆

James Denney.[1]

By Principal Emeritus W. M. Macgregor, D.D., Trinity College, Glasgow.

To-day we are filling a blank in the visible records of our College. During its eighty-two years it has enjoyed the services of many teachers, whose renown has been much more than provincial—Lindsay, Bruce, Drummond, Smith, Orr, Denney; and it is right that somewhere on our walls their names should be inscribed. 'Let us now praise famous men and our fathers who begat us. . . . Their bodies lie buried in peace, but their wisdom still is declared, and the Church sounds forth their praise.'

When I came up here in October 1881 Denney was entering on his third year in Divinity. He was then a shy, austere, rather formidable figure, a little older than many of us, and by no means easy of approach. In the Theological Society, where others splashed in the shallows, theorizing and talking at large, he was able to push out into deep waters as one who knew his way. He had been by far the most distinguished student of his time in the University, and to us he appeared as already a master in Classics and Philosophy, in Literature and the history of opinion within the Church. He had the most admirable gift of pregnant and witty and often demolishing utterance. And to this rich intellectual equipment he added an overawing sense of the religious realities in their dogmatic form. Students then were much as they are to-day, and it is not surprising that in choosing a President for the Society we preferred someone nearer our own level. He was not arrogant but he was a little remote, and he was terribly impatient of words without knowledge. Thus, although he had a circle of devoted friends, the majority of us would have declared of him what Emerson said of Thoreau: 'I would no more think of taking his arm than of taking the arm of an elm-tree.' But in supplement or modification of this, I may mention a trivial incident of some years later when, for the first time, he appeared as candidate for a vacant congregation. He was one of a leet of five for the old Free Church in Troon, and an elder there afterwards told me that each of the other competitors, forgetting his own interests and ambitions, had independently advised the Troon people to choose Denney. For this was a man by himself.

---

[1] Address at the unveiling of a Memorial in Trinity College, Glasgow, 18th May, 1938, to Principal James Denney.

Those who knew him later will recognize in this impression of student days features and characteristics of their friend—the touch of shyness and austerity, which made others shy until they came to know him, the passionate depth of religious feeling in its Pauline form, and the amazing ease and fullness of mind which enabled him throughout his life unfailingly to answer every call. When he left his charge in Broughty Ferry he burned his sermons, and to the end he declared that he would not scorch a finger in rescuing his manuscripts from a conflagration; and why should he, when he always had himself to draw upon? His *Letters*, though written in days of overwhelming occupation, are unlaboured and delightful, full of ideas, full of wit, with stories of children interspersed; and his talk had the same enviable quality. Disraeli once said that famous wits were often the dullest of companions, because they incline to hoard up their good things for some more important occasion; but, as Denney once observed, 'it is the things a man says without thinking which have the sap of nature in them.' Certainly his good things did not come from his memory, but freshly from himself, and they were often astonishingly good. When Lord Haldane had delivered a lecture of notable energy and quite as notable obscurity in New College, Edinburgh, one of us asked Denney if he had always seen where the lecturer was going: 'No, but he was going as fast as he could.' After listening to a paper on Maeterlinck, he muttered: 'It is bad enough to be at sea, but to be at sea in a fog!'

This last example suggests another persistent characteristic of his mind—his almost fanatical love of clearness. His intellect in all its operations had a keen, cutting edge; in confessing that he never used illustrations in preaching he adds that what is needed is not illustration but lucidity, and this he always attained. He stoutly affirms that 'a poet is a man who can say what he wants to say; if he cannot say it he is not a poet, no matter how much he may stimulate critics to guess what was in his mind and say it for him.' Dr. Moffatt justly remarks on the strong hold which the eighteenth century had upon him—that age when even 'philosophy bent itself to be lucid and practical.' This appears very much in his style, which allowed him always to say great things in the most concise and simple way, and it made him bemoan the weakness of his students, not one man in a score of whom could 'say what he means, or put his mind plainly down on paper.' It also affected his attitude to practical affairs, making him impatient of those who juggled with abstract nouns: 'There is nothing that tends more to intellectual degeneration,' he said, 'than to play with words like establishment and disestablishment, and imagine that in doing so we are dealing with anything.' This eighteenth-century lucidity helped him vastly as an expositor, impelling him to clear away the litter of scholastic irrelevance of which so many commentaries are full. 'The worst of being erudite,' he asserts, 'is that a man forgets how many things are better forgotten.'

In his own use of Scripture the two sides of his nature—the scholastic and the humanist—are sometimes in conflict. In his earliest book he says as a humanist that 'the Apostles were not people speaking with the servile precision of modern science, but with what Plato calls a gentlemanly freedom in the use of words.' So when Paul's words favour the idea of a mystical union (which Denney disliked), he boldly explains the phrase as 'the language of passion, with an emotional and poetic truth, not to be translated into prose.' But where Paul's words give support to those doctrines which were most intimately sacred to Denney, no such evasion can be admitted: 'Paul not only felt this, he thought it, and thought it out articulately.' I suspect that in this case he was wrong, but, as he once said of Dr. Moffatt, 'he has a right to be wrong, for he is a master in the business.' Very markedly this passion for clearness affected his dogmatic thinking, inclining him in some points to make the world clearer than the Creator has made it. He loved the saying of Vauvenargues that 'an idea which cannot be clearly expressed is not true,' and accordingly he was suspicious of mysticism of every degree. He charges even Calvin with 'making a mystery out of his own head about the Lord's Supper—a mystery where no mystery should be.' Any talk of the mystical union (which plays so noble a part in much Reformed Theology) annoyed him almost as much as it did Ritschl: 'There is a mystical union, if you like, between a stone and God, but the union of man with God transcends the mystical and rises into the region of the intellectual and moral.'

One more of his characteristics must be noted, as it held to him from youth to age—the curious dash of paganism or, at least, of humanism in a mind so vehemently Christian. He quotes with approbation Amiel's saying: 'It is a real want in a man when his mind is always in Church.' Immediately before coming here as Professor he writes to a friend: 'I want off for a bit to bathe my lungs in air and my brain in paganism.' In one place he sighs for a touch of 'the vitriolic commonsense of Voltaire.' Of a prominent ecclesiastic he remarks: 'I do not think he will be made Moderator. . . . His virtues, for lack of a little vice of some kind, never effervesce or sparkle.' In certain moods he confesses that that blackguard of genius—Benvenuto Cellini—was more interesting to him than the Fathers or the Reformation divines. In this he resembled a Scots commentator of the late eighteenth century who excused himself for reading *Tom Jones* on the plea that 'it was grand stuff for taking the taste of the Apostle out of your mouth'; Denney would never have put it so roughly, but we cannot forget that, alongside of the scholastic and the saint in him, there was this rich element of the humanist, giving spice and savour to all that he said. Robertson Nicoll speaks of a period of Broad Churchism in Denney's career, referring, I suppose, specially to his devastating reply to Drummond's *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*. This anonymous pamphlet, which in some ways was the most significant and detached utterance in theology published in Denney's lifetime, was largely an explosion of the humanist in him, encouraged by his experience of common men and common women during his years of mission work in the east end of Glasgow. But, as Job says, 'God enlargeth a nation and straiteneth it again,' and in Denney there was a marked swing back to the scholastic in theology, as is seen in his *Atonement and the Modern Mind* and his *Death of Christ*, great as the virtues of these books may be. In the two supreme achievements of his lifetime—his Commentary on *Romans* and his *Jesus and the Gospel*—both sides of his nature find expression; and in his unrevised book on *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, published after his death, the humanist struggles hard to gain utterance.

On this endowment so various and so splendid many influences from without were playing, and of these the greatest and most penetrating was that of his wife. It was she who fully liberated in him what Nicoll calls 'his eager tenderness.' Soon after her death he wrote to Nicoll that in their twenty-one years together he had never had a thought in which she had not a part, and as long as he lived she was never absent from his mind; even a good story makes him think of how she would have enjoyed it, and of her merry laugh. She was in every way a notable woman, wholesome, direct, devout, and glad of heart, and she brought him much that in himself he lacked. She urged upon him the scantiness of pathos in his preaching, often telling him, as he confessed, to 'keep down his hand in the pulpit and be gracious.' I remember her telling my mother how she warned her husband that 'a man never knows how dull he can be until he tries to lecture through one of Paul's Epistles.' Six or seven lectures on end she might allow, but then the people ought to have a rest for a week or two. A woman so shrewd and loving and gay could not fail to humanize her husband. They never had a child of their own, but it is beautiful to see how in his *Letters* he reports the ways and words of children, for with this shy scholar—this great man—they always seemed at home.

Then he was enviably rich in friendships, some of them with very notable men. Of his class-mate, Grant of Greenock, it was said by Hugh Mackintosh: 'If all the Churches of the land were to be judged, each by the quality of a chosen representative, I would choose Alexander Duncan Grant to represent the United Free Church, and I should have no fear of the decision.' Inseparably joined to Grant was that man of sparkling genius, J. P. Struthers; and from these two heart friends Denney had no secrets. And there were others—Robertson Nicoll, Carnegie Simpson, Moffatt, and men and women of less distinction—to whom he wrote and spoke without reserve as they did to him, so that his heart and mind were never in risk of stiffening.

But he had also the enriching experience of intimate association with common people. A Professor of Theology who has not been a working minister is scarcely half prepared for his task. When Denney had completed his triumphant career as a student he plunged at once into mission work in the east end of Glasgow, where he spent three years; then, declining the invitation of Troon, he went to a church in Broughty Ferry, where Bruce had been and where Moffatt was to come, and there he established himself not merely in the admiration but in the affections of his people, so that through the twenty years of his professorship he was looked to by many as still their minister. In the *Letters* it is manifest how his heart went back to the Ferry—to the men and women and the little children; and it is still more manifest that the theology which he taught to his students was the gospel which he had seen at work amongst his people, transforming the simple and building them up in character. He commends the Shorter Catechism as 'an excellent basis not for dogmatic but for evangelizing,' and late in his life he writes to a friend: 'It is my business to teach, but the one thing I covet is to do the work of an evangelist.' With Hezekiah he would have exclaimed: 'O Lord, by these things do men live, and wholly therein is the life of my spirit!'

Finally, in his last years, Denney was drawn into a heroic participation in the public life of the Church. His first appearances in the Assembly had been in defence of the evangelical Reformation doctrine of Scripture, which was threatened by outbreaks of stupid panic, and they were hilariously received, as such speaking, in the quality of it, had scarcely been heard since Robertson Smith; for, like Smith and Rainy, Denney never took part in a debate without making a contribution to the subject. When he joined the Committee for Conference with the Church of Scotland he at first, like others, was provoked by the futility of the discussions; there was so much playing for position, with strong assertions on the one side and the other lest some fragment of cherished testimony should be endangered, and it was freely muttered in the Committee that the chief causes keeping the churches apart were the Secretaries. Denney impatiently asked if the Conference really represented the churches at all, and reckoned that the loss of two working days in College in each month was an exorbitant price for him to pay for all that was done. 'The one hope of Union,' he said, 'is to leave off talking about words, and try whether we cannot agree about things and duties.' When Dr. Archibald Henderson boldly struck out in this direction, followed by Christopher Johnston (afterwards Lord Sands), Denney bade any one who prayed for the peace of Jerusalem to 'pray specially for the health of Henderson,' who was growing uncomfortably old.

This maxim—'not about words but about things and duties'—was a guiding rule in all Denney's public tasks. His work for the Central Fund carried him into innumerable manses, familiarizing him with the strain and difficulty under which much of the Church's work is done. But another maxim, in supplement of the first, increasingly laid hold upon him. Of Chalmers he had once said that 'he had the greatness of the Nation in him as well as of the Church, and it is an immense gain to a Churchman when he has such an interest in the State as keeps his ethics from becoming ecclesiastically narrow in their range.' This was magnificently evident in Denney throughout the long agony of the War, and his interest in the well-being of the State inspired him in the last campaign in which he engaged. When friends condoled with him because broken health was delaying his Cunningham Lectures, he answered: 'The things I *am* sore about are not being able to help the Temperance cause and the Central Fund.'

Under the shaping of such influences his character was unfolded and enriched. Nature had equipped him splendidly for the rôle of scholar and teacher: a profound personal experience had revealed God to him, so that in God's presence all his thinking and all his activities were conducted. But human love at its noblest, and intimate friendships, and the familiar companionship of plain folk and the discipline of large affairs, all played their part in producing the man we knew, and whom to-day we commemorate. His uniqueness was such that, as Dr. Moffatt has remarked, 'no one can be said even to put you in mind of Denney.' And thus, on this enduring brass, we have inscribed the words: 'Supreme alike as scholar, teacher, administrator, and man of God: to whom many owed their souls.' And from Bunyan we have taken what seems to fit him like a glove: 'My sword I leave to him that shall come after me in pilgrimage, and my courage and skill to him that can get it.'

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By the Reverend J. W. Jack, D.D., Glenfarg, Perthshire.

The influence of Egypt on Israel has often been discussed. It must not be forgotten that it contributed, in some ways at least, to an advance in truth and morality. The ivories, *e.g.*, discovered at Samaria in the royal palace of Ahab are nearly all marked with Egyptian *motifs*, several of which seem to have a distinct connexion with Maât, the goddess of truth, justice, rectitude, integrity, and similar virtues. There is evidence that the doctrine of this goddess received an impetus in the Near East through the conquest of Jerusalem by Sheshonk I. (Biblical 'Shishak'), the first king of the Twenty-second or Libyan Dynasty, who ascended the throne *c.* 945 B.C. It is known that a powerful revival of Egyptian rule followed this conqueror's invasion of Palestine (1 K 14[25ff]) and continued for many years. Along with it the moral qualities of Maât, which had probably exerted some influence already on Israel, found a new and more abundant entrance, and it is not unlikely that these had some effect on the prophetical schools of Israel, leading them to prefer the sacrifices of 'righteousness' to those of bulls and rams. We know that this preference manifested itself strongly at this period, increasing as time rolled on and occasioning much of the strongest invective. It became the main burden of the prophecy of Amos, and found its classic expression in the well-known words of Micah, 'What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly?' etc. (6[6ff], cf. Hos 6[6], Pr 17[1] 21[3], etc.). At the same time, the fact remains that, on the whole, the life and religion of the Egyptians had an evil effect on Israel. We have ample proof of this in the amulets or charms which have been recently found in the tombs of Lachish. Many of these certainly received their inspiration from Egypt, while others had been imported from there. Several of them, made of blue glass paste, are images of the god Bes, in his traditional grotesque attitude, while others represent the sacred ram *Khnum*, the cat of the goddess Bast, the sphinxes, and other things. Such magical objects (cf. Is 3[20] R.V. 'amulets'), which were believed to protect both the living and the dead against malign influences, have been discovered not only at Lachish but at Gezer, Taanach, Megiddo, and other sites. They show a wonderful variety in form, substance, and colour, and in numerous cases have been traced to Egyptian influence. At many sites, too, such as Gezer, Megiddo, Samaria, Beth-Shemesh, and others, Egyptian eye-beads ('Horus eyes') have been found. To the Egyptian these chiefly symbolized the sun-god's watchful care and providence, and to the Hebrews or Israelites they must have conveyed the same idea about Yahweh. In such a case they had no baneful association, except when used as amulets or magical objects. God 'sees' the worshipper, and naturally his 'eye' was regarded as the symbol of his watchfulness (cf. Ps 33[18], Ezr 5[5]), and representations of His eye have been found on Hebrew seals. We have but to think also of the many-eyed wheels in Ezekiel's vision (Ezk 10[12], cf. also 1[8]), and the many-eyed cherubim and seraphim in Enoch's (*Secrets of Enoch*, 21[1]).

At ancient Mari, the powerful capital of Northern Mesopotamia in the days of Abraham (and also for many centuries before), further evidence of the marvellous culture in this region has been discovered by M. André Parrot, the Director of the French expedition. The great palace, which forms the most complete example of architecture hitherto unearthed in Mesopotamia, must have been the largest of its kind in the third millenium B.C. As at present excavated, it covers more than five acres, with 220 rooms or courts, though a full quarter of the building still remains to be revealed. The number of tablets that have been found stored away in the cupboards or scattered in different rooms has now reached nearly twenty-five thousand, and when these have been fully deciphered (the work has been entrusted to M. Dossin, Professor at Brussels and Liège), our knowledge of the whole story of the Babylonian world in the time of Abraham and Hammurabi will be considerably enlarged. The excavators have discovered the remains of a ziggurat or temple tower in the city. Though only the lower part of it is now in existence, this still reaches a height of nearly fifty feet. The interest of it lies mainly in the fact that there is a temple, in excellent condition, cut in its side. Two ferocious-looking bronze lions (in reality made of wood covered with thin bronze leaf), with snarling jaws and ready to spring, stand at the door, as an intimation that the temple was reserved for the initiated few. Quite a number of sculptured lions (about fifteen, judging from the stone eyes picked up) appear also to have safeguarded the sanctuary, but all these unfortunately must have been destroyed (probably for the sake of the bronze) when Hammurabi sacked and burned the city (2032 B.C.). They remind us of the lions which adorned the great brazen laver of Solomon's temple (1 K 7^{29}), and which must have been of Babylonian or Mesopotamian origin. According to the tablets, one of the kings (believed to be Zimrilim, who reigned here in Abraham's time) kept a number of live lions. It was not unusual, indeed, for oriental monarchs to have pits or dens with live ones enclosed (cf. 'Darius the Mede,' Dn 6^{7}), the animals being used as executioners. The lions of Palestine and Mesopotamia made their homes in thickets (Jer 4^{7}), forests (Jer 5^{6}), mountains (Ezk 19^{9}), and similar haunts; and as they were less formidable than those of the African jungle (being sometimes attacked by shepherds single-handed, cf. 1 S $17^{34\text{ff}}$), they could often be caught by driving them with loud shouting into nets or pits (cf. Is 31^{4}, Ezk $19^{4.8}$). Even though 'Darius the Mede,' into whose den of lions Daniel is said to have been cast (Dn 6^{16}), be a fictitious creation, the result of a mixture of confused traditions (as seems likely), the story of his live lions appears to have an historical basis, for a Persian cylinder-seal in the British Museum (No. 89, 132) gives a picture of Darius (probably Darius the Great, 521–485 B.C.) in his chariot hunting lions in a palm forest, evidently in order to secure them for his den.

In regard to the interpretation of the Lachish Letters, it is interesting to note that the conclusions which we put forward in March last, and which appeared in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for May and in the *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* for July, have been arrived at also by René Dussaud of the Louvre, the well-known Semitic scholar. In a lecture on the subject given to the Académie des Inscriptions, on April 29th, he regards all the letters as dating just before the fall of Lachish (588 B.C.), and says in effect: 'The prophet mentioned cannot be Uriah, as Professor Torczyner thinks, for this individual was put to death several years earlier. He can only be Jeremiah, and the letters are all the more interesting on this account. Hoshaiah's group, from whom the letters came, consisted of pious Judæans, who were naturally supporters of Jeremiah, and the letters reflect this prophet's views.' The alphabetic script (generally known as the 'Phœnician') used for the letters raises afresh the whole question of writing in these early times. We not only find many new forms of the 'Phœnician' characters, but it is clear that such a script, which had probably been derived from the Proto-Sinaitic one (dating from the nineteenth century B.C.), was fully developed and in constant use among the Hebrews long before the close of the Jewish monarchy. The greetings contained in the letters and the conventional formulæ used, as well as the mention of other letters received, returned, or forwarded, show that written communications between individuals were common in the land. The script must be the same one used by Jeremiah when he 'wrote in the book' (אֶכְתֹּב בַּסֵּפֶר, Jer 32^{10}), and by Baruch when this scribe wrote down Jeremiah's words upon a roll (Jer $36^{2.\,4.\,28.\,32}$). It was probably employed by prophets, historians, psalmists, lawgivers, and others, and its development from the Proto-Sinaitic down through the Bronze Age to the Iron one, must have been largely due to the Hebrew race. As some of the examples of it found on bowls and other articles do not appear to be the work of highly cultured persons, it follows that it must have been understood and used by ordinary people. It was only during the Exile that the 'Phœnician' characters fell into disuse among the Hebrews and gave way to the 'Assyrian' form (consisting of square characters of Aramaic origin), which is the one now adopted, and the one used in the earliest manuscripts of the Old Testament that we possess; and ultimately, long before the Christian era, the 'Phœnician' script was abandoned and forgotten, though the Maccabees who relieved the Jews from oppression in the second century B.C. endeavoured to restore it and used it on their coinage. The usual writing material in Old Testament times, especially for sealed messages, was papyrus, which was unfortunately of a perishable nature in the Palestinian climate, and this accounts to a great extent for so few specimens of the script having been discovered, and for so many original documents and state annals having disappeared. Frequently, when papyrus was scarce owing to invasion or other national troubles preventing its import, writers fell back upon potsherds as Hoshaiah, the author of the Lachish Letter, did.

The Wellcome-Marston expedition at Lachish, which is now under the leadership of Mr. Charles Inge, has had another successful season. Notable among the discoveries have been three more examples of the 'Phœnician' script, just referred to, written in ink on fragments of pottery. One has on it five personal names, followed by numerals, which probably represent quantities of oil, wheat, or some other commodity. A second is apparently a receipt, and was found in a room which shows signs of a conflagration. It begins with the words 'In the ninth year,' and as this was the very year of

Zedekiah's reign when Nebuchadrezzar's forces invaded the land anew (after defeating the Egyptian army of Hophra) and finally burned Lachish (588 B.C.), we have an excellent confirmation of the Biblical record (2 K 25[1], 'the ninth year, the tenth month, the tenth day of the month'). The third fragment is a very small one, written on both sides. It begins with the words 'To my lord,' as the eighteen letters found in 1935 do, and is thus a document of the same type. In addition, some scribblings, believed to date about 600 B.C. or a little earlier, and to be the work of a schoolboy, have been found on the vertical face of one of the palace steps. They consist of rectangular lines, a drawing of a lion, and the first five letters of the 'Phœnician' alphabet in their accepted order. We may thus gather that this script was not only in general use, but was probably being taught in the schools as early as the seventh century B.C.

Although numerous temples of imposing grandeur, belonging to the third millennium B.C., have been unearthed in Mesopotamia, it must not be assumed that such buildings, with their professional priests and orderly ritual, existed also in Palestine in these early times. It was not until the Late Bronze Age (1600–1200 B.C.) that temples became common in the latter country. Before this period the sanctuaries were merely open-air shrines ('high places,' Hebrew, *bāmōth*), either outside or inside the city walls. We have an example of such at Bethel, where Jacob set up a sacred stone (Gn 12[6-8] 28[18]); at Shechem, near which there was a sacred tree in Abraham's time (Gn 12[6] 33[18-20]); and at Jerusalem, where the priest of El Elyon brought forth offerings and blessed Abraham (Gn 14[17ff], Ps 76[2]). In this early age the sanctuary or 'House of God' consisted simply of one or more pillar-stones, which served both as altars and images; a tree stump or post rudely carved as a rule into a human semblance; a well from which water could be obtained for libations; and often a tumulus where some ancient 'man of God' was buried and whose spirit was believed to brood over the place. The whole sanctuary, being sacred ground, was generally enclosed within a circle of boulders or standing stones. Many of these open-air shrines, such as the Canaanite ones, were connected with Baal and Astarte worship, and were loathsome to the Hebrews on their settlement in the land. They were taken over by them, however, without much change in appearance or form of worship, being merely consecrated in future to the worship of Yahweh. Excavation of such places shows that the old Canaanite type of worship was to some extent retained, though overlaid by the Israelite one—a fact in harmony with the universal experience of history as to the permanence of sacred sites.

The earliest temple building so far discovered in Palestine (apart from one at Aï, and one believed to have existed at Lachish) is at Shechem, and dates from about 1600 B.C. (the later period of the Hyksos). To a large extent it is an adaptation of the ancient outdoor high-place, for it consists of nine rooms surrounding a large, central, unroofed court. It was only after this time that worshippers in Palestine, influenced by the great neighbouring cultures, especially those of Egypt and Mesopotamia, began to erect suitable structures for religious service. It was probably through the influence of the Nile Valley that they developed such places and adopted a certain amount of style and ritual, and through Mesopotamian connexions that they were led into the cult of the mother-goddess, whose figurines have been discovered in such large numbers.

Remarkable correspondences are still being discovered between the Old Testament and the Ras Shamra tablets. One of the most interesting (to which H. L. Ginsberg has recently drawn attention) is in 2 S 1, where the lamentation of David over the death of Saul and Jonathan is given (being quoted from the 'Book of Jashar'). In v.[21] we read: 'Ye mountains of Gilboa, let there be no dew nor rain upon you, nor fields of offerings.' This is almost the exact language that occurs in the epic of Dan-el (1 D, 43 ff), where this demi-god, impelled by grief over the death of a beloved friend, calls down a curse of drought on the land: 'Seven years may Baal fail! . . . (Let there be) no dew nor rain, nor upsurging of the Deep [*i.e.* through the springs].' The importance of the identity of expression lies in the fact that, if we write the two parallel sentences out side by side in square Hebrew characters, we notice that the Hebrew words וּשְׂדֵי תְרוּמוֹת ('nor field of offerings') in the Biblical text, which have proved a difficulty hitherto to Hebrew scholars, are probably miswritten for ושׂרע תהמת ('nor upsurging of the Deep'), as found in the Ras Shamra epic. The identity, moreover, shows that David, if he was the author of the lamentation referred to, had some knowledge of the old Canaanite literature, written at least four hundred years before his day. It is probable that such literature circulated throughout the land, and its spread was aided by the remarkable commercial activity that went on from Phœnicia. Much of the literature (history, epics, mythology, etc.) must have been well known to the Israelite schools of the prophets, and hence the numerous cases of identity of expression on the part of the latter.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Training Your Temper.

By the Reverend C. M. Hepburn, B.D., Moulin, Pitlochry.

'Dearly beloved, . . . give place unto wrath.'—Ro 12[19].

In writing to the Christian people at Rome St. Paul said, 'Dearly beloved, . . . give place unto wrath.' Of course, that doesn't mean give it a place, but don't give it a place. Don't give way to it. Or perhaps you may remember it better if I put it like this, 'My dear friends, never lose your temper.' At any rate, here is how I was reminded of that text. A short time ago I enjoyed a marvellous thrill. There was a great Test Match between the English and Australian teams at Lord's Cricket Ground in London, at which I was lucky enough to be present. In both elevens there were many very fine players, some, indeed, who are famous all over the world. Don Bradman, for instance, who is usually followed about admiringly by a mob of small boys. And on our side, one who is almost his equal—Wally Hammond. But there was another I was anxious to see, Fleetwood-Smith by name. Fleetwood-Smith is what is called a googly bowler, very slow and twisty and tricky. Sometimes a batsman will start smiting his bowling all over the field, but Fleetwood-Smith doesn't get ratty, he simply smiles, and bowls steadily on till the batsman swipes once too often and gets caught out or bowled. And that, undoubtedly, is one of the secrets of his success—not getting rattled, and so losing his length, and bowling rashly. That is why the crowd in Australia call him, so I learned, 'The man who never lost his temper.'

And an excellent reputation it is. I'm afraid it can't always be said of all of us. And it is a pity, for people who flare up in a temper are really a weakness to themselves and their side. On one of Shackleton's expeditions to the Antarctic one of the men was a very fine fellow in every way excepting one, he couldn't apparently control his temper. As a result every one else was set on edge, and Shackleton had to send him back in case he should wreck the expedition. Only good and cool tempered men can stand the trials and silence of the Antarctic. One reason why the heroic men who went with Scott and reached the South Pole did so splendidly was because, as somebody wrote about them, 'no single hasty or angry word' was spoken by them.

And, of course, the most serious danger in losing one's temper is that it leads us in the heat of the moment to say or do things that may cause grave harm, and it's little good being sorry about it later on. Perhaps the most celebrated Czar of Russia was Peter the Great. But seemingly he had one bad shortcoming. In a fit of temper one day he struck his gardener, and a few days afterwards the gardener died. On hearing about the tragic occurrence, brought about by not controlling his temper, Peter said sadly, 'Alas, I have conquered other nations, but I have not been able to conquer myself.' Yes, truly it is wise to try to train your temper.

And above all, remember that it is the mark of a good Christian to restrain one's temper. It was told of Dr. Aggrey of Africa, one of the gentlest and most lovable negroes who ever lived, that in his early days as a teacher he would sometimes break out into awful tempers against the pupils, giving way to sharp words and even blows. But, by and by, after becoming a Christian he gained perfect control over himself. And do you know what his motto was, when many a time people slighted him and sneered at him because he was black?—'Keep your temper and smile.' Isn't that just what any good follower of Jesus Christ should seek to do? How wonderful His example was. As the Bible says, 'Who, when He was reviled, reviled not again: when He suffered, He threatened not.' So whether in cricket or in the greater game of life, will you also try not to lose your temper, but 'give place unto wrath.'

Rubbish.

By W. Rhydderch Evans, Login S.O., Carmarthenshire.

'There is much rubbish.'—Neh 4[10].

A schoolmaster and his class made up their minds to break all the school records by making a 100% attendance for a whole month. The first week they succeeded; the second week also had a full attendance; the third week ended without a single black mark on the register; the fourth week came, and the first day saw every child present; so did the second day; but alas! on the third day two children—a brother and a sister—were absent.

The record was lost! Was the master angry? I should say he was. He shouted (as masters do when they are annoyed), and promised the culprits a bad time. Indeed, so angry was he that he went home that evening past the children's home; and it so happened that as he approached, the two children met him. Their faces were black with soot and perspiration, but they smiled happily. Little did they know what was in store for them! The storm-clouds began to gather around the master's face.

'Why were you two absent from school to-day?' he demanded.

'Oh sir,' was the reply, 'we were absent because we are moving into a new house and we have been burning the rubbish of the old.'

Their master said not a word. He just nodded his head and passed on, but that reply has kept ringing in his ears until this very moment.

'Moving into a new house and so burning the rubbish of the old!'

Now, was not that a wise thing to do?

Of course it was! And yet how many of us, I wonder, fail to do just that very thing, for you see, when we carry the hatreds, the failings, the quarrels, the bad tempers of yesterday into to-day, what are we doing but carrying the rubbish of the old house into the new?

Again, the nations of the world, when we see them holding on to the enmities and the misunderstandings of the past, we see them carrying the rubbish of the old house into the new.

Now, whatever else we know about rubbish, we know at least three things: First, rubbish is something which has lost its usefulness. Take a look into the dust-bin! There you see pots and pans, tins and cans, all of which have lost their usefulness and so have become rubbish. Second, rubbish is something which has lost its value. 'If the salt have lost its savour—it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out.' It has lost its usefulness, and so its value, and it has become rubbish. Third, rubbish always takes up the room of something better. When mother has finished spring cleaning, have you noticed there is always more room for things? Shall I tell you why? Because all the rubbish has been cleared away. When Nehemiah looked about him, he cried, 'There is much rubbish.' We can say the same, but as we move from day to day, let us remember the children's answer and do likewise. 'We are moving into a new house and so we are burning the rubbish of the old.'

The Christian Year.

Fourteenth Sunday after Trinity.

A Harvest Thanksgiving Sermon.

By the Reverend J. G. Grant Fleming, D.S.O., M.C., M.A., Aberdeen.

'Moreover the profit of the earth is for all: the king himself is served by the field.'—Ec 5[9].

'Give us this day our daily bread.'—Mt 6[11].

'Look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest.'—Jn 4[35].

These three texts underline for us the message of Harvest, a message which is specially appropriate to a service, where with praise and prayer, with the service of thought and gifts which we have brought for others, we celebrate the gathering in of the fruits of the earth.

From earliest times men have marked this great yearly beneficence with one observance and another. For the Harvest so fulfilled the year's hopes and so crowned the year's toils that men simply could not let it pass with unmoved hearts, without expressing somehow their thankfulness. And so when the fields had been fully reaped and the last sheaf triumphantly garnered, then they brought some of the fruits as an offering to the great Creator. In Christian times men gathered in their hamlets to hold their Harvest Homes, and in their churches they came together for thanksgiving and praise.

It is well that we too should not allow this season to pass unmarked, for amid the complexities and artificialities of our modern life the Harvest brings us back to three primary truths—three truths of which we ought to be reminded over and over again—three simple and primary truths: the first, a truth of simple observation; the second, a truth of simple faith; and the third, a truth of simple duty.

The first is seen in our first text. It comes to us from Ecclesiastes, who was a realist, one who saw things in their stark reality without any glamour of romance, one who saw and told of the plain and obvious facts about life, and here in our text he tells the unvarnished truth about the Harvest: 'The profit of the earth is for all: the king himself is served by the field.' And what he means is just this: that we are in the last resort utterly dependent on the farmers of the field. That is a truth which is being underlined for us in this uncertain, difficult age in which we live.

There is an old story of a man who had gathered much riches and gold; and his fellow-citizens used to hold him in a kind of reverence and envy him for the means he had of gratifying every desire. But one year the Harvest failed, and there was a famine in that little land, and the man's store of gold was as rubbish in his hands, and in presence of the lack of bread he was no better off than his poorest neighbours. Yes, even the king himself is served by the field. And however men may amass wealth or earn wages, still all their wealth and all their wages would be as nothing unless the earth bestowed its Harvest gift. It should be a humbling thought to those who sometimes bear themselves loftily and disdainfully, a humbling and a healthy thought to recall how utterly they would be dependent on the common earth in a time of crisis, on the rough-handed men who in winter's cold and summer's heat till the land and sow the seed, and reap the ripened fruits. For even the king himself is served by the field.

The profit of the earth is for all. It is a strange thing to reflect—commonplace though it be—that if, even for one year, the earth withheld her gifts, then all our stores of learning and invention, all our gathered treasure, all our slowly built-up civilization, yes, even the race of humankind itself, would all go down in darkness and everlasting night. We can well understand how St. Francis long ago addressed the earth in words like these:

Dear Mother Earth, who day by day
Unfoldest blessings on our way.

'For the profit of the earth is for all: the king himself is served by the field.' But is this plain, obvious truth about the Harvest which Ecclesiastes saw and told the whole story? Is it all the truth? Is there not an even greater and more wondrous truth beyond it? Yes, of course there is, and all down the generations men have felt that there is: they speak forth this truth as they breathe these words from the Lord's Prayer: 'Give us this day our daily bread.' As in spring, year after year, they watched the infant blades of corn adorning the earth in a lovely mantle of green; as in autumn, year after year, they saw the fertile plains covered with a golden sea of waving grain; as they watched that stedfast giving each returning year and reaped the Harvest, their thoughts went forth beyond this dumb impassive earth, went forth to Him who gave so much. Behind the gifts of earth they saw God's hand wide open, giving liberally; and behind the stedfast fidelity of earth they heard His voice make promise saying: 'While the earth remaineth, seedtime and harvest shall not cease.'

The mercies of God, 'ever faithful, ever sure.' That is the second truth about the Harvest, and it makes the Harvest very wonderful, does it not? The simple fact of Harvest is itself a wonderful thing, that year after year throughout the ages the earth should unfailingly bring forth her fruits and give them to man's needs—that is very wonderful. But it becomes far more wonderful when we remember it has its changeless prompting and its changeless security in the faithfulness of God. Every time we walk by autumn fields rich with Harvest, we can say, 'That is the Heavenly Father giving us our daily bread.' And every time we sit at table, that same daily bread can be to us another messenger of the Divine care and love.

But these two simple truths together speak forth a third—the lesson of a simple duty. There is no Harvest without faithfulness in this way. If the profit of the field is for all and God's care and thought for us so wonderful, our thankfulness will surely be one of loving service? Our response will be a glad one in which we shall seek to share the joy and gladness of our faith in God's gracious thought for us with others. We shall see that the treasures of the field are indeed made available for all, especially for the poor and needy: 'Distribute unto the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven,' said Christ. We shall do our best to ensure that every one has the right to earn his daily bread, that no one hungers, no one suffers from want or poverty. As we pray, 'Give us our daily bread,' we shall make certain that others share in God's glorious blessings, for every one, as well as the king, ought to be served by the field.

And one of our first cares will be to prepare for another Harvest; by sowing the good seed in this and other ways; and perhaps for all who love the Master and seek to serve Him, the best way will be to dedicate ourselves to service in the great Harvest field of Christ's Kingdom. It is only by bringing men to Him who is the Harvester of souls that the true blessings of the Heavenly Father's love can be known. The reason for this is not far to seek, for over every Harvest field there is a shadow, the shadow of death—death that will spring forth again in new life certainly, but still death. And the need for men and women who will give themselves to the duty of winning others for Jesus Christ is tragically apparent to-day, for if the Harvest that the Spirit has promised us is not wrought for, famine and death may be our portion in this strife-ridden world. Every one has a simple, yet imperative duty in this great Harvest—to win men from death unto life. Let us be servants of Him who has shown us how God cares for all, rich and poor, high and low; who taught us to pray for our daily bread; and who in His life and death gave Himself for the harvesting of the souls of men.

FIFTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Two Eternities.

'God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross.'—Gal 6^{14}.

On a day that was not yesterday, nor the day before it, a little company of men and women sat by the lip of the sea that washed a Western isle. They were waiting for an emigrant ship. Steep above the bay rose a green hill. And because they had nothing else to do the young men climbed it. There they built a rough cairn, and on it, as though in response to some deep imaginative instinct, they set a wooden cross, a memorial to that hour of parting and adventuring. 'It stands,' they said to the old folk left behind, 'for our pain and sorrow and for our hope of victory as well.' Then they sailed away. But every year on the anniversary of that July morning their fathers and mothers gathered round the rude cross, and prayed to God for their dear sons that their heart-pain might be small, and the face of fortune kind.

Now the Cross is one of the inescapable facts of our experience. 'After you are forty years of age,' a modern mystic tells us, 'look out for a cross. Sometimes you have merely to carry it. Sometimes your spirit is nailed to it, but at all times you have to accept it.' It is the very marrow of truth. There is the cross of ill-health. There is the cross of the broken dream. Its fragments lie at your feet, and as you look at them you know that no magician can piece them into oneness and beauty again. There is the cross of doubt, about those tremendous facts—God: His Son: the future life, and that happy country which lies beyond the horizon of those dark hills we call death. For faith is an immortal bird that must be for ever on the wing of love and prayer. Put it into the imprisoning cage of care and custom, and then, when some day you open the cage, you discover that the poor bird has lost its power of flight. And, to take one other, there is the cross of the bitter knowing, and that is the knowing that you are not loved for yourself alone. From this random list we turn with a mingled sense of relief and triumph to the Cross of Christ. We watch Him, with a new and instant happiness in our heart, dying there. We feel like the fabled giant who stepped from mountain to mountain murmuring, 'If only they below could see as I see, they would feel exalted and glad.' We share in the rapture-cry of Paul, 'God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of my Lord Jesus Christ.' And all this for this reason. The secret of the Cross is the Christ who died on it. He is the meaning of the Cross. He is the glory of the Cross. He is the victory of the Cross.

If we wish to put meaning and glory and victory into the simplest English then we may say that Jesus on His Cross is the proof of the two eternities that meet in us. The first is the eternity of spirit. The second is the eternity of love. These are the twin suns that shine above the Crucified. Is our ultimate splendour, and everybody's, not that we are able to say, 'I have this or this or this. I have securities and good investments. I have a brain that is tempered and fine. I have personality. I have influence or charm or a genius for friendship,' but that we take our stand under the Cross and are able to say, 'I am like my Lord and Saviour. I am a spirit immortal, and in this spirit of mine I salute the power of an immortal love'? We can say with Tatian, 'I am above fate'; or with Hector Dunoisse 'I am greater than a thousand kings. I am a man for whom Christ died and in whom Christ is now alive.'

The notes of this spirit in us are so clear and valiant indeed that they are not to be mistaken. The first is *Christ's passion in us for truth*: the truth about ourselves; about the world we live in; about the balance of dues we must pay our body and our mind alike; about our mental sincerity; about our faith in brotherhood as being the only possible way to happiness; about God's fatherhood as being the one fact that gives us that inner quiet and sets us free from the shackles of doubt and care. Jesus says, Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free. He invites us to share His mind and spirit so that we may make the discovery that our faith is not merely a tower of refuge, but a bridge as well—a bridge across which we may adventure into the territories of truth and freedom. The less we know of God the less vital is our faith in His kindness and goodness, the less He stands for in our scheme of things. The more we know, the more our reverence, the finer the quality of our happiness, the deeper our awareness that with the new strength that is in us we can wait until He tells His secret, and draws the veil of mystery aside. Here is a delivering fact that has no equal in science or philosophy—we may know the truth about God. It is possible for our minds to arrive at such a knowing of His mind and of His thought about us that the wonder of it fills our whole being with light and gladness.

But what positive things can we know about God? The answer is that we can know what Jesus knew. And that is this: God is a Spirit, mysterious, living, creative, and unreachable, except by that part of Him which is in our spirit. And God is the Holy One. Everything in Him and of Him is perfect. And He is the Infinite and all-embracing Mind, which means that we are not alone upon this universe. There is One who reads our secret purpose towards good. There is One who knows our struggle with the self of our flesh. There is One who smiles when joy comes knocking at our door. What a thought of splendour! How that cry of Robert Leighton stirs us to a new recognition of the Divine in us. 'The greatest affairs surcharge Him not and the very smallest escape Him not. He orders the march of armies and the events of battles. Yet thou and thy particular condition slip not out of His view.'

The second note of the eternal spirit in us is *Christ's passion for justice*. The foundation of this justice lies deep hidden in our secret thought. But it must not stay there. It must flow forth into speech and deed. We must be its heralds. And this most of all in how we think of others or speak of them or judge them. We have to be just and kind to our neighbour. We have to conquer the lower self with the strength that faith and true prayer pass into our spirit. We have to reproduce in thinking, in speech, and in decisions something of the tenderness that glows in Jesus, something of His uncompromising straightness: something of His scorn for falsehood; something of the magnificence of His charity.

The third note of this spirit in us is what we may call *the note of a progressive harmony*—harmony between our mind and the mind and the will of God. Not that the harmony will ever be a perfect thing; for as long as our spirit must conduct its business within the framework of physical conditions there are bound to be discords and jars. Yet as we feel and recognize that year by year our mind is entering into living peace, that the power which things have over us grows less and less, that simplicity and friendship and delight in all loveliness are the good companions of the soul, that giving, whether of our mind or of our money, is the most enriching exercise in all the world, that the awareness of the Divine Spirit housed in our own is joy's crown of joy—as we feel all this, and know it for reality, the tumult and the shouting dies, we walk along a pathway of light; our heart sings a happy measure; we have reached the place where our life is hid with God in Christ.

Here, then, is the inward meaning of the Cross. Jesus died on it. And by His dying, He shows us that evil is a conquerable thing and sin a forgivable thing, and that we are rulers over two eternal empires, the empire of spirit and the empire of love.[1]

SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Challenge.

'Whosoever shall compel thee to go one mile, go with him twain.'—Mt 5^{41} (R.V.).

About five hundred years before the birth of Christ, when the Israelites were in captivity in Babylon, there lived a Persian king named Cyrus. So great was his power to frame law that we can trace some of our modern legislation—such as military conscription—right back through the Romans and Greeks to his legal code.

There was no organized postal system, and Cyrus invented one. Sometimes the messenger would require help, so legislation was effected giving him power to press into the king's service man, beast, or boat.

The Romans had been greatly influenced by the Persians, both in religious and social custom. Indeed, at the time of Christ, compulsory service was prevalent throughout the Empire. Wherever the courier went he could command service for the Emperor. But the law of compulsory service had much wider application than this. When the cohort passed through any district, the inhabitants were compelled to carry the baggage a mile in and a mile out of the village. Roman troops had the power to requisition able-bodied men as porters, guides, and servants. Such was the justification by which Simon of Cyrene was compelled to carry the Cross. Probably Christ had seen many a man who formed part of His audience pressed into the royal service against his will. In any case, the disciples knew perfectly well to what He alluded when He spoke of the second mile. He was taking a legal custom to enforce a moral truth.

'Whoever shall compel thee to go one mile, go with him twain.'

1. *Man does not express the fullness of his personality by living upon the average plane.* When living on the average plane, man's record has ever been one of failure. The Bible lays particular emphasis on this. Its whole story is one of divine forbearance with men living below their capacity.

Jesus once drew a very clear distinction between this idea of merely existing and of living the full life. 'If thou wouldst enter into life, keep the commandments.' Now that is the average plane, the respectable convention, the first mile. But what of the next? 'If thou wouldst be perfect, go sell.' Ah! That is more than a Commandment. It is in excess of what is expected. Get beyond the legal standard. Strive on to the goal of the second mile. Conventional living may be respectable, but it is never heroic. The line of least resistance may be safe, but it is never brave. Christianity is God's provision for a world in a mediocre state. The gospel is Christ's gift for a spiritually starved humanity. Our text is a challenge to conventional morality. It demands that we should rise above the normal. No life comes to its own in any other way.

---

[1] A. Maclean, *Walk in the Light*, 242.

2. *The natural man is ever satisfied with the average standard.* Normal manhood is enough for him. Dr. H. F. Sanders said, 'It would seem that the public conscience has always tended to be lower than the Christian ideal, and the result invariably has been a compromise between the vision of the best men and the easy going habits of the majority.'

In the long human story it seems that the world has little use for those who live outside the realm of the average standard. Those who are below, it penalizes; those who are above, it martyrs. That is why it came to be that Barabbas and Jesus were found on a day together. Outlaws and prophets are exiles to the world's convention, and both are equally condemned. That is why the dungeons of history have held life's two extremes—the worst and the best. And so Newgate in 1662 held many a rogue and many a saint. Listen to William Dewsbury, enfeebled after nineteen years imprisonment: 'In the prison home I sang praises to God, and esteemed the bolts and locks put upon me as jewels.' Such was the spirit of Bunyan in Bedford, and George Fox in Worcester. The perpetual problem of a world living in a lesser plane has been to find place for the men who drag behind the first mile, and those who push on to the second. Society is ever satisfied with the dead level of mediocrity. 'Our innermost temptation,' says Dr. Fosdick, 'is to reduce ourselves to the lowest common denominator, to sink ourselves to the ecclesiastical average to help to put down the worst in men, but at the same time to miss the best. The hope of the Church lies in leadership above the average and ahead of the time.'

3. *It is in response to the challenge of the second mile that Christian character is wrought.* In the last analysis, the difference between the average man and the great heart is not a difference of gift, or talent, it is a difference of character.

One thinks, for instance, of the two great characters of the Reformation—Erasmus and Luther, the two souls who kindled the smouldering embers of religious zeal into a white hot flame. But we think of them in very different ways. For the one we have admiration, for the other, reverence. Erasmus, in the dark day of his visitation, said, 'I intended to be true to truth as far as the times would allow.' Luther, in the assembly of princes and papal legates at Worms, answers Eck, 'I retract nothing except I be convinced from the Scripture. Here I take my stand. God help me.' Erasmus trembled at the further step, whilst Luther took it. It is the last step that is the test of character. Are we forgiving beyond requirement? Are we more faithful than our vows? Are we juster than the Law? Let us rouse ourselves to that test, for it is in response to the challenge of the second mile that Christian character is made.

4. So we would urge this higher life because *it is the two-mile manhood that has achieved the best in the past, and is the hope of the future.*

The Church has received her full measure of criticism in this age, and some of it she may have deserved, but despite it all, let it be remembered that with all her faults, she has been the comfort of the world, she has mothered the race, and saved the people. In the arena, and in the catacombs, through the Inquisition, and out with the Mayflower the pilgrims have kept their vigil, and the light has never been dimmed. They it is who have carried the lamp the second mile—sometimes singing, sometimes fainting, sometimes struggling, but always advancing. The romance of history, the glory of the past, the vitality of the ages have been but the strength of the worthy sons of the second mile.

We go on our daily round gathering our little sum of earthly good, and at times we are weary of it all. Yet we can get something more out of life than this. But we can do it, not by drawing out, but by plunging further in. The Christian ideal is a challenge to further achievement. The weariness of the first mile is overcome by adding the romance of a second.

To every man there openeth
A Way, and Ways, and a Way,
And the High Soul climbs the High Way,
And the Low Soul gropes the Low,
And in between, on the misty flats,
The rest drift to and fro.
But to every man there openeth
A High Way, and a Low.
And every man decideth
The Way his soul shall go.[1]

---

[1] E. E. Johnston, *The Puritan Heritage*, 17.

Seventeenth Sunday after Trinity.

Christian Morality.

'What do ye more than others?'—Mt 5^{47}.

What *do ye more* than others? A very searching and disturbing question.

Two preliminary words concerning this urgent and vital matter. First, that the ultimate Christian test is a moral test. Not an ecclesiastical test, nor a theological test, but a character test. Mankind has always found it easier to be religious than to be good. It is not, 'Do ye believe more confidently or accept more unquestioningly?' but 'What *do* ye?' And the other thing is: that the test is positive and not negative. So many well-meaning people have been content to define themselves in terms of what they don't do: to affirm their Christianity, and claim superiority, by virtue of the things they abstain from doing, the things they have given up. But Jesus Christ never based Christian character on what we don't do but on what we do. Of course, there are many things that we ought not to do. But there are two ways of not doing them. The first, by making a list of them and avoiding them: the other by accepting a splendid vision of duty—or of something higher and more compelling than duty—and taking a path that winds uphill all the way, conquering the evil by 'the expulsive power of a new affection.'

Clearly, our Lord's expectation and canon of judgment is that His gospel would not only produce character, but better character. It is not only in essence 'doing,' but 'doing more.'

As Christians He expected them to be better: to live, and to impress the world with a new, a better type of life. There can be no question that they did, or there would be no Christian morality to discuss. Christianity would never have been a success if Christians had not succeeded in convincing their world that they had something that the world had not. It wasn't the—to the Greeks, fantastic—assertion of the resurrection of Christ that wrought this great wonder of history, primarily. No; the thing that impressed that world was the Risen Life shining through. 'What do ye *more* than others?' It is by 'the more' that the world judges us, and is entitled to judge us. It is by 'the more' that our Lord judges us.

Now it is evident, from our Lord's affirmation here, that others really 'do.' It is unjust, and it is untrue, either to deny or belittle that. When St. Paul writes to the Romans, 'When the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness'—he affirms not only the existence of a natural conscience, an indelible instinct of right and wrong, but he affirms a very real recognition of it in circles far beyond the limits of Christianity.

And yet Christ expects of us 'more than others.' How are we to define the 'more?' Where are we to look for it? Is it by adding to the list of virtues? Doubtless Christ added to the content of morality and raised the actual precepts of morality. And it is not more than the truth to say that it was Christianity that democratized virtue, that opened the way of the highest to the lowest, as that Greek world had never dreamed it to be possible. 'Virtue,' in those days, was almost a class distinction.

All this is true, and it is a great truth; but it is not on this side that we must seek the real key of our problem. For the crux of Christianity is not in its popularity, but in its essence: not in the number of people, and the type of people, who come to accept its teachings, but in its principles. Its principles always rather than its precepts.

'What do ye more than others?' What were the others doing? Do we remember that Epictetus the Stoic, who, as far as we know, came into no contact with Christianity at all, wrote the following: 'My duty to my father is to take care of him . . . but you will say, he is an unjust and unnatural father. What is that to the purpose? This obligation of duty does not arise from the consideration of his goodness but from the relation he bears you.'

Or, the noble list of virtues Marcus Aurelius gathers into a single sentence for which he thinks a man ought to strive. 'Sincerity, seriousness, endurance of labour, aversion to pleasure, contentment with thy portion and with few things, benevolence, frankness, no love of superfluity, freedom from trifling, magnanimity.' Who of us would venture to claim that we had achieved these virtues, that we had done even as much as 'others.' But it appears that even if we had achieved all these excellencies, our Lord might still ask, 'What do ye *more* than they?'

The only answer to this problem that can satisfy our hearts and consciences comes from a realization that behind Christ's disturbing word 'What' here, stands a vital 'Why.' For behind this whole problem of a specifically Christian morality and conduct lies the question of *motive*. It is not primarily—or ultimately—a question of what I do, but of why I do it. It is not a question, fundamentally, of attainment, but of ideal. Our Lord Himself not only authorized, but enforced, this unique criterion of Christian conduct when, speaking of John the Baptist, He said: 'I say unto you, among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding he that is *least* in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he.'

Secular morality, however high, has its limits clearly defined. Few, if any, ever reach those limits. For a Christian even to reach those limits would be a great achievement. But with Christian character the point is that, with the motive once securely grasped, there are no limits. For Christianity, on the practical side, does not consist chiefly in aiming at a few great things, but in doing all things in a great way, a new way, from a new motive. It is not an ethic, but a life, in which

Dross becomes gold, and as of old,
The water turns to wine.

'Love your enemies.' It is hard. To forgive them: not to wish them any harm. That we might do. But to *love* them! And yet it is conceivable that Marcus Aurelius and Epictetus might have *said* it. Love them, serve them, they seem to say, as a stern duty. Is it not high? It is. Have we reached there? But few of us. Is there anything nobler than loving enemies? No! 'For God commendeth his love to us, that while we were yet enemies, Christ died for us.' Even God has no higher end. But there is a *better way* of loving them, a surer and more enduring way. It is loving them for Christ's sake. At the very heart of this probing question of our Lord's is implicit the question of *motive*. Loving, doing, being, for Christ's sake. 'Whoso loseth his life for my sake'—that is the root principle of Christian morality: the solution of the problem of the Christian 'more.'

Urgent and cogent as duty is, and imperishable as the law of conscience would appear to be, yet within the shadow of mere duty there always lurks that ominous word *Why?* It is raising its voice disturbingly and rather clamourously to-day, in much of our drama and literature.

Why suffer? Why sacrifice? Why surrender? Why trample upon inclination and instinct? Why not seek your own things and let the rest look out for themselves?

Who would say that duty has no imperative answer? For many it has: for a certain high type of soul, always. But, behind Christian morality, behind the highest and hardest demands of Christian character, is the impregnable buttress of the strongest thing in earth or heaven—love.

The greatest virtue that some of us possess is not any of the moral attainments that might conspicuously distinguish us from others, but just the supreme virtue of going on, of trudging painfully but confidently along the rising way: of hoping for ourselves, because *He* goes on hoping for us and bearing with us, and calling us His own. Remembering that Paul even called himself 'the chief of sinners,' not because he was worse than other people (far from it!), but because now he no longer measured himself against the most exalted and exacting standard of human virtue, but against Jesus Christ. Indeed, it may be said that the one supreme addition to morality that Christ made is that of a new and unique kind of faith. Faith in Him based on love of Him; and, therefore, an entirely new faith in ourselves. What do ye more than others? We believe in Him: we love Him.

Talk they of morals, O Thou dying Lamb?
The true morality is love of Thee.[1]

[1] H. E. Brierley, *Life Indeed*, 214.

Contributions and Comments.

'House' and 'Home' in New Testament Greek.

In the Greek of the New Testament two cognate words are used, ΟΙΚΟϹ and ΟΙΚΙΑ, both commonly translated indifferently as 'house.' That both words are derived from a common root and that both on occasion have this meaning in classical Greek requires no argument: that they are used indifferently in the New Testament may be questioned. If we may invoke the aid of the comparative method, we may observe that in English 'hospital,' 'hostel,' and 'hotel' all descend to us from a common source, yet however uneducated and unlettered a speaker is amongst us he will never be found confusing these three words. This suggests then the propriety of examining without prejudice or prepossession the way in which the two Greek words we are considering are actually used in the New Testament. A detailed review of all the instances of their occurrence would be tedious here, it must suffice to record in a summary form the results of a careful scrutiny, and then to offer a few observations on some interesting examples where, if the distinction here suggested should prove sound, some points of historical interest seem to emerge.

Briefly then it may be said that OIKOS means 'home'; it is used of the Temple where English phrase prefers to speak of God's house, though strictly the Greek calls it His home. Moreover, it is used by a natural development for a man's household, or better, 'home folk' or family. Where classical Greek said OIKOI, 'at home,' the New Testament writes ἐν (τῷ) οἴκῳ, and similarly for the classical OIKΔE the New Testament following the same analytical usage has εἰς (τὸν) οἶκον.

OIKIA means 'house,' regarded as a mere building without implying or at any rate insisting that it is a man's 'home.' Hence εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν ἐν (τῇ) οἰκίᾳ, merely mean 'indoors' as opposed to 'out in the open air,' whether in the unpeopled country or by the seaside or elsewhere.

A clear example of the distinction is to be found in Mk 7^{24} 'in a house' and ^{30} 'come home.'

In Mk 10^{29} our Lord speaks of the man who has given up 'a house'—not his home or family, after which, had it been so said, brother or sister or mother would have been tautologous. That our Lord should put the house in the forefront suggests, if I may dare to express what it brings to my mind, that our Lord like St. Joseph before Him was not a carpenter but as has been inferred from the use in the papyri, an architect—a conclusion supported perhaps by the way in which illustrations are drawn by our Lord from the building on the rock and on the sand (Mt $7^{24. 26}$), from the hasty inception of building without sufficient means (Lk 14^{28}), and the building of the Church upon such faith as Peter exhibited (Mt 16^{18}). This will lend an added intimacy to the conservation about the lengthy building of the Temple and the speedy rebuilding of the human frame which housed Deity (Jn 2^{19-20}), and the disciples' comments on the beauty of the Temple buildings (Mk 13^{1}).

The healing of the paralytic would seem to have taken place in our Lord's home at Capernaum (Mk 2^{1}), which agrees with St. Matthew's statement (4^{13}) that our Lord transferred His home from Nazareth to Capernaum before the call of St. Peter and his partners to be trained for their apostleship, a statement indirectly confirmed by St. Luke (4^{30-31} and 5^{8}).

In our Lord's home at Capernaum also the disciples asked why they could not exorcize the evil spirit which possessed the epileptic boy (Mk 9^{28}), which again may reasonably be connected with St. Matthew's story that it was at this time in Capernaum that the disciples were rebuked for disputing about their respective rank (Mt 18^{1ff}, Lk 9^{46ff}, and Mk 9^{33}, the last reference showing that the incident occurred indoors and at Capernaum).

A word of comment may be given to the form in which one of our Lord's sayings appears in the three synoptic evangelists. 'A house divided against itself' appears in St. Matthew and St. Luke in a form which would dwell upon the physical condition of a building—let us say after an earthquake or the rain, the flood and the wind of the Sermon on the Mount. St. Luke more naturally speaks of a household or family (Mt 12^{25}, Mk 3^{25} and Lk 11^{17}).

The centurion's servant lay ill not 'at home' as the A.V. has it [1] (perhaps still following in the train of the ambiguous Vulgate *domus*), but 'in the house,' a form of expression which will seem still more natural if account be taken of St. Luke's extended narrative corrective of St. Matthew's more concise summary which follows the legal maxim 'QUI FACIT PER ALIUM, FACIT PER SE.'

One or two final observations may be offered. It is obvious that both 'house or home' may be used of the same building with however a slight change of emphasis, thus in Mt 24^{43} the householder would not have allowed his 'house' to be broken into, where St. Luke speaks of his 'home' (12^{39}). To receive a visitor or guest into the 'home' implies more intimacy than into the 'house,' and so where a visitor comes to stay the night OIKOC is generally used, while when he comes for an odd meal OIKIA [2] is usual. In conclusion it should be mentioned that St. John twice uses OIKIA in a way that deserves comment: in 14^{2} he makes our Lord say that in His father's OIKIA are many mansions;

---

[1] The R.V. has changed this to 'in the house,' but it has not consistently drawn out the distinction we are considering (in Mk 2^{1} it has 'in the house').

[2] In Ac 2^{46} and 5^{42} κατ᾽ οἶκον has been translated in the A.V. 'from house to house' and 'in every house,' evidently influenced by the Vulgate 'circa domos'; the R.V. has 'at home.' The correctness of this translation or 'in their homes' is corroborated by Ro 16^{5}, 1 Co 16^{19}, and several other passages, and it seems clear that St. Luke is indicating how this original practice of the Church in Jerusalem differed from that followed and perhaps originated in Corinth (1 Co $11^{18. 22}$, Ac 20^{7}). In Ac 20^{20} κατ᾽ οἴκους is 'in your various homes.'

here OIKOC[1] would naturally have meant the earthly Temple. In 4^{53} he states that the man believed, and his whole OIKIA: perhaps he felt that OIKOC would suggest the family only and not the servants. St. Paul and St. Luke must have included family and slaves in OIKOC (Ac 16^{15}, 1 Co 1^{16}, Col 4^{15}), but St. Paul in Ph 4^{22} uses OIKIA where plainly there is not likely to have been any question of members of the Emperor's family.[2] T. NICKLIN.

Ringwood, Hants.

---

[1] The distinction urged in the text lends support to the suggestion that the Temple was the scene of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on Whitsunday (Ac 2^2) (the house).

[2] It is to be noticed that in He 3^{2-6} the erection of a material building is not in the author's thought, but the founding of a family.

Genesis i. and John i. 1–14.

It is impossible for any one to be blind to the exact correspondence of the opening words of those two chapters—'In the beginning God' and 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God'—in both 'In the beginning God.' But is there not reason to think that John had more of the story of Creation in his mind than simply what follows. 'All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made.' Made by whom? The Word! 'God said.' And what was the first thing God said? God said, 'let there be light: and there was light.' What corresponds with this in the case of Word? 'In him was life; and the life was the light of men.' And just as at the Creation all at first was chaos, so here 'the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not.' The parallel is not carried farther in detail. But is it forcing things to see analogy, which is at the same time contrast, once more in the climax—'And God said, Let us make man in our own image, after our likeness,' and 'the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us'? The crowning fact in the first creation was man made in the image of God. The crowning fact in the new creation was that God 'took upon himself the form of a servant and was made in the likeness of men.'

ROBERT J. DRUMMOND.

Edinburgh.

◆

Entre Nous.

Our Fiftieth Year.

With the next number THE EXPOSITORY TIMES begins its fiftieth year, and we hope to make something special of the occasion. For twelve months general surveys will be given of subjects that are live to-day, with a comparison of what the situation was fifty years ago. This AFTER FIFTY YEARS Series will be begun in October by Principal Vincent Taylor writing on 'The Gospel and the Gospels.' Sir F. G. Kenyon will follow on 'The Text of the Greek New Testament'; Professor T. H. Robinson on 'Higher Criticism and the Prophetic Literature'; Professor E. O. James on 'Aspects of Sacrifice in the Old Testament'; Professor W. D. Niven on 'Eschatology and Primitive Christianity'; and the Rev. Norman H. Snaith on 'The Background of the Psalms.'

In GREAT TEXTS RECONSIDERED, great New Testament passages, which have been the subject of controversy, will be chosen. The first study—in October—will be by Professor J. M. Creed.

'Pacifism' has been undertaken by the Bishop of Liverpool; 'Christian Preaching and Sin,' by Professor T. H. Robinson; 'The Non-Christian East in the Christian West,' by Dr. Nicol Macnicol; 'The Church and the Child,' by Dr. F. J. Rae. These will have their place in PROBLEMS OF TO-DAY.

Recent social experiments will continue to be described. Mr. Clarence E. Pickett, of the American Friends' Service Committee, will be the next contributor to CHRISTIANITY IN ACTION.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

H

1.996

ART
GUILD

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY